THE FORTNIGHTLY

MARCH, 1947

THE EXPOSURE OF ENGLAND

BY WILLIAM RYDAL

THE crisis over fuel which burst like a thunder-clap on February 7 may yet be turned to good account. It has compelled the Labour Party—and indeed the country as a whole—to face up to the grim facts of Britain's economic situation and put first things first. As Mr. R. H. S. Crossman, one of the Party's ablest 'young men', said in the debate on February 10, it has brought home for the first time to the general public, to the workers—what the Minister of Fuel and Power entirely failed to do—the narrow margin of safety on which post-war Britain is operating.

This is no time for recrimination between the political parties—the chain of causes for the actual debilitation of the coal industry goes back twenty or, if you like, fifty years—but it is a time for frankness; and it is precisely in this respect that Mr. Shinwell, and indeed the Government as a whole, lamentably failed. Belatedly the *Daily Herald,* in its issue of February 8, came out with the exhortation 'tell the people'—but thereafter jerked back on to the party line. The indictment was well and truly made, however, by the Parliamentary correspondent of the Socialist weekly, *Tribune,* who, in a brilliant evocation of the shade of Mr. Lloyd George, trounced the Government for its craven fear of trusting the people. The offence is no less heinous than was that of Mr. Baldwin ten years ago who, on his own admission, feared to reveal to our democracy the grievous plight of Britain's armaments. Moreover, Mr. Shinwell's gamble and refusal to court unpopularity by a timely rationing system for fuel and power stands out the more glaringly in contrast with the decision of his colleague, Mr. Strachey, last summer in favour of bread rationing. The Minister's defence (made at his press conference on the day after the crisis broke) that " rationing was not introduced at the end of summer because everyone would have got too little " is surely the lamest imaginable excuse, and even the White Paper issued on February 21 does not demonstrate a complete understanding of what must now be done.

The facts are these. Production of coal in this country had been decreasing steadily year by year before war broke out in 1939. This was due partly to the old-world organization of the industry, the selfishness and rigid conservatism of the coal-owners, on which the Samuel Report and the Sankey Commission had thrown a revealing light; partly to defective and obsolete machinery, on which the Reid Report dilated: but mainly to the state of mind of the miners themselves as a section of the national community, a psychological

'fixation' which made them regard life in the mines as a helot existence, from which the younger generation must at almost any cost escape. Moreover, it disposed them to view any measures for improvement of conditions short of nationalization of the mines as victimization. In 1939 the number of men at work in the mines had dwindled to 800,000. By the end of 1940 it was only about 700,000—and the decision to draft miners into the forces led to a further etiolation of the industry. Thus, as Mr. Attlee recalled in his statement to the House of Commons on February 10, for the ensuing five years Britain was bound to face a critical position every winter owing to insufficient stocks of coal. The crisis was overcome during the war years, thanks to the drastic closing of non-essential industries, the black-out and the expedient of double summer time, which considerably curtailed demand. But, with the return to peacetime conditions it was bound to recur—and the greater was likely to be the deficiency of stocks, the more successful the production drive. That in itself explains why, while the country did not sustain any serious dislocation in the winter of 1945-46, it could not hope to "scrape through" this year.

In the circumstances the Government was entirely right to give its attention chiefly to purifying the fetid psychological atmosphere of the industry—in a word to nationalization, at the same time setting in train the necessary large-scale and long-term re-organization which, America tells us, will take a matter of twenty years. And, by the same token, there is everything to be said for seeking to secure a higher level of wages, particularly for the face workers, as one or two of the Labour speakers counselled in the Debates on February 7 and 10. But these considerations of morale, important though they are for the specific problem of attracting recruits, ought never to have blinded Mr. Shinwell—as apparently they did—to the grim material facts. The statistics were there to point the warning: the country started the winter of 1946-47 with only eleven million tons of coal in stock as against fourteen millions at the same time the previous year. Mr. Douglas Jay in the House of Commons last October had indeed predicted that on those figures by March 1947 stocks would have been reduced to only one week's supply. Thus, the failure of the Government to relate this supply situation to the inevitably mounting demand for fuel and power—and to its total economic policy—was unpardonable. And, if only the public had been taken into confidence by being given all the facts, there was a cast-iron case for the imposition last summer of appropriate restrictions on both industrial and domestic consumption of fuel and power so as to build up adequate stocks: especially when there was already in existence a points rationing plan, prepared by Sir William Beveridge in 1942, which had received the warm commendation of the then President of the Board of Trade (who is now Chancellor of the Exchequer) and which would have been introduced then, it appears, but for the stern and unyielding opposition of the Conservative Party upholding private interests, to which Mr. Churchill bowed.

It is not only in the matter of enlightening the nation on actual stocks and

requirements that Mr. Attlee's Government has fallen down. Much more needs to be said about the extreme vulnerability of Britain in her efforts to rebuild her shattered economic estate. And not through White Papers only, which, by definition, are taken as read by the unthinking public, but through the equivalent of Roosevelt's fireside chats from some Cabinet Minister. The country is suffering now for the over-hasty manner in which the Government committed us to the Washington Agreements of December 1945: how few people, outside the expert sphere, appear to be conscious of the immense liabilities which were thereby incurred. Mr. R. P. Schwarz has detailed in THE FORTNIGHTLY* the extent of those liabilities and has made the specific point that both the Credit Agreement and the Trade proposals represent a considerable encroachment on the financial, economic and hence political, sovereignty of Britain: they signified, he wrote, " the complete dependence of this country on her unique lender during the most crucial first years of the post-war period when fundamental decisions of policy will have to be taken." The Socialist rebels who berate Mr. Bevin for a foreign policy which, to all intents and purposes, makes Britain into a satellite of the mighty U.S.A. might reasonably be asked to face up to the unpalatable economic and financial facts. What more can be asked of the Foreign Secretary, so long as the parlous economic plight of this country continues to be what it is, than that he keeps his wicket up—no use expecting any forcing strokes?

There was a good case to be made out against a Britain heading for Socialism accepting that condition of subordination: and many of us consider that, had Mr. Attlee's Government then had the courage of their convictions, stated the grim facts of our post-war legacy and called upon the people to accept a yet greater measure of privations in order to avoid it they would have found a ready response. English people, essentially pragmatic, will always understand the need for cutting one's coat according to the cloth. But the Labour Party missed that opportunity: and now it will be—is being—forced, in the different circumstances prevailing—that is, with England as a pauper depending on highly capitalist America—to cut the coat of its fancy according to the (American) cloth.

What that means in relation to the coal crisis, was set forth in a masterly letter by Professor Lionel Robbins published in *The Times* of February 14. Let us not hear so much about deficient stocks, he says, but appreciate that the root of the trouble is deficient supply. And, that being so, immediately the war was over the increase of coal production should have been marked at Priority No. 1: the only way to secure this increase *quickly* was to augment the numbers employed in the industry. He then goes on to discuss the coal shortage in relation to its effect on our external balance:

> If we do not succeed in increasing our over-all exports by at least 75 per cent. before the dollar credits run out we shall be faced with external bankruptcy. We shall not

* *The Anglo-American Agreements.* February 1946.

> be able to get the food and materials we need. We shall not be able to meet our external commitments. Yet our export drive is being throttled for want of coal and throttled for want of the other scarce materials, particularly steel and timber, which we could procure from abroad if only we had coal for export . . . . All the finicking discussion of the gap between production and " requirements " of which we have heard so much in recent months . . . . assumes exports of token magnitude. Could blindness to the real requirements of our very desperate position go further? . . . .

With another 100,000 men, native or foreign, in the mines, he concludes, all this could be remedied. It is a question of somehow getting back to the pre-war level of coal exports which would earn the country so many tens of millions of pounds worth of foreign exchange per annum. This is strong meat. But Professor Robbins speaks truth. And the gravamen of the charge against the Labour Government is that not a cheep has come from any of the Ministers concerned with trade and production on this aspect of the problem. Coal for export is not on the agenda. It is not even specified as a desideratum in the White Paper. Yet, as Professor Robbins says, it can be done; difficulties of greater magnitude were overcome during the war, and it is inconceivable that any obstacle, technical or psychological, should be allowed to stand in the way.

Apart from the Government's Public Relations failure, however, there is another aspect of the coal crisis which requires special consideration, particularly as it may prove to have significant political repercussions. Members of Parliament of all parties have complained with justice of the neglect to tap the reservoir of potential foreign labour. Now, it is not suggested that foreigners would take so easily to working in England where our ways are peculiar as under Continental conditions—but when the Minister of Labour excused the Government's inaction by prating of the language barrier and the difficulty of finding accommodation, he was just talking nonsense. The real obstacle, as is well known, has been all along the opposition of the miners' union, fearful lest the introduction of foreign labour on any substantial scale should affect the workers' hard-won standards of living. And this is symptomatic. The ostrich mentality of the Trades Unions has not only bedevilled the basic problems of the coal industry, it has hamstrung the Government on many other matters of production and economic policy. Lord Samuel in the House of Lords debate, in his warning that the present crisis had a larger economic setting, had the courage to speak of what many people are coming to say in private—of the " dangerously close connection of the T.U.C. with the Government." It is dangerous because there is abundant evidence—for example, the closed shop agitation—that the trades union movement, as a whole, with its continuing demands for reduced hours and increased wages, has not adjusted itself to the changed economic situation in which there is not an abundance but a shortage of labour; it is being carried along by its own momentum to flout the needs of the emergency. Mr. Attlee's Government can afford to ignore the growling of the Conservative opposition—though the fact must be faced that now for the first time the confidence of the middle-of-the-road opinion which decides

elections has been shaken: the rigid and restrictionist practices of the trades unions, however, may well fatally hamper it in carrying out for industry after industry certain indispensable measures of economic planning.

Whether the time has come for the shattering of the existing party moulds remains to be seen. The Trades Union block vote, as it happens, is probably no longer necessary to the party of the Left, whose big battalions will continue to vote for " their own people ", rather like the fans of ' the Arsenal ', whatever their form, against any coalition of elements from the Conservative and Liberal parties: Disraeli's " two nations " are more than ever polarized to-day. At all events the exposure of the country's economic predicament which the present crisis has occasioned may prove a salutary shock: neither the Government nor the ordinary man in the street can fail to see that it is now no longer a question of the world standing to marvel at " the expansion of England " but at her terrifying exposedness.

LIBERALS AND TORIES

By Walter James

THE Liberal party has lost many seats, but hardly one of its vices. Chief among them, since Lloyd George did his fatal work, has been a tendency to fission. It is natural, when two parties are out of power, for them to seem less objectionable to each other than does the common enemy, and into this easy and dangerous attitude the Liberals have too often fallen. They can scarcely be said to have fought the 1945 election against Labour; they ignored Labour almost entirely and reserved all their shot for the Tories. Nor was this a sudden piece of electoral strategy. In the months before the election a detestation of the party that had reigned so long had been driving a strong body of Liberals farther and farther to the Left; these were the days of Radical Action and schemes of wholesale planning, hot from Oxford, that would have left the soberer Socialists aghast. Nowadays we hear less of Radical Action and more of alliances between Liberals and Tories. A group of Liberals and Conservatives dined together last year, found much in common and opened conversations. Out of it came a statement drawn up, with judicious Liberal emendation, by a young Conservative M.P. on whom the mantle of Lord Randolph Churchill has only doubtfully descended. This document was modern and emphasized more production; it was Liberal and breathed Free Trade; it was acceptable to both sides, because it expressed their shared odium of the party now in power.

No harm was done as long as these amiable diversions were confined to clubs and drawing rooms in London, but the inevitable indiscretion occurred early in their career and the whole story appeared in a Sunday newspaper, causing disturbance to many loyal Liberals up and down the country. Justifications were pleaded by those responsible; the cause of freedom and the safety of the State were said to be greater than party. But in fact these explanations were unnecessary; all that had happened was that once again two parties out of power had found unbearable the dominion of a third. The spoils of office glittered and an expedient cabal to grasp them was called a defence of freedom. No one can say that the Conservative party is injured by this traffic, which still persists, but what of the other? C. P. Scott said all there is to be said, when he wrote of an earlier understanding between Liberals and Tories:

> It is possible to divide the Liberal party for a time and thereby gravely to injure it. It is possible by thus weakening it to drive some of its more active elements out of the party and into the ranks of Labour. It is possible to draw some of its more

conservative elements into direct association, or fusion, with the Conservative party. It is not possible to do any of these things without striking at its life.

And that life of the Liberal party is something this country needs to have preserved. It would be a national and not a sectional loss if a party that sought to base itself on principle, and not on interest, were driven under by the factious indiscipline of some of its own members.

It is a truism that freedom, the principle which Liberalism exists to defend and widen, is in danger to-day. There is no call to see the present Government as especially tyrannous in character, but its Ministers are agents of the new technique of planning, which, though no modern Government can avoid it, contains within itself serious threats to the freedom of the human person. Planning is essential if the material needs of society are to be satisfied, but it is at the same time in conflict with spiritual goods, of which personal responsibility is among the first. It is a new method of ordering society and has burst into our time almost with the impetus possessed by the Industrial Revolution. The immense sacrifice of human values brought about by the sudden change in the methods of production around 1800 must not be repeated in the equally sudden revolution in governmental method which planning involves. But the sacrifice will again be made, and human rights again be ridden down by a new technique, if the dangers to freedom go unrecognized and the battle for it goes unfought. Planning and freedom can exist together, but only if the forces of freedom fight for their place.

Conservatives have astutely judged that the real political issue of the time is between freedom and planning, or, as it might be called in this country, between socialism and liberalism. They are eager to cast themselves for the rôle of freedom's defenders and some of them recently proclaimed their membership of a " party that stands for the preservation of our ancient liberties." For the bulk of Conservatives this means no more than that they should bitterly oppose every form of industrial nationalization and State control. This is a mere rearguard action against the planning technique, which is in the stream of history and may not be rejected, and if it were persisted in the Conservative party would quickly stand out as a self-condemned anachronism. But a handful of Conservatives—those with whom some Liberals are dealing —see deeper than this. They have some perception of the real issues and believe that the proper course for their party is to abandon obstructionism and to accept the forces of social change while moulding them into forms appropriate to a free society.

These Conservatives are few and weak, both in the parliamentary party and in the country, and yet it is for the sake of these men's good graces that certain Liberals are willing to play fast and loose with their own party. They pretend that the young politicians with whom they talk may one day capture the Conservative leadership; they toy with the idea of a Liberal infiltration into the comfortable acres of the Tory domain, so that safe seats and high

principle may once again march together. It is an unworthy folly. As things stand now, the country will not for a moment see in the Conservative party freedom's true defender, and if freedom has no other spokesman its cause is already lost. The Conservative party, like Labour, cannot be taken by anyone as standing mainly for a principle. Both the great parties represent interests and little more; they are the two nations arrayed one against the other, more clearly defined now than they ever were in Disraeli's period. The Conservative party has been proclaimed a bulwark of many things—of monarchy, of constitution, of religion, of empire. But the ordinary man, who decides these matters, judges by what he sees and hears, and if he looks at election time to the Conservative party he sees in its candidates, its supporters and its fleet of cars the outlines not of principle but of wealthy interest, and he sees the truth. These candidates may declare that they are standing for freedom, but the plain voter knows that they are standing for something else as well.

When Conservatives begin talking of freedom, it is not a moment for Liberals to seize their hands, but to rejoice that shrewd opponents should have sensed that the weapons in the Liberal arsenal, which have long been rusting out of public notice, are going to be of value in the political campaigns of the immediate future. Liberalism and its values have suffered long neglect. Under the pressure of the wind that has blown from Russia, from Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy through the world, men are being attracted once more by that conception of political freedom combined with a respect for the dignity and rights of each human person which is the crowning achievement of the West. To no guides should they be able to turn with more confidence than to Europe's Liberal parties, and particularly so in this country. That men are so turning may be seen especially in the universities, where the Liberal clubs are as flourishing as they were dead half a generation ago, but that they are receiving the guidance they have a right to expect may be doubted. As has been suggested, some modern Liberals seem to have a keener appetite for intrigue and for the mechanics of political advantage than they have for hard thought. This is not the way to pass a period of political eclipse. Borrowing one of the themes from Mr. Toynbee's *A Study of History,* this time of enforced " withdrawal " from the stage of active power should rather be spent in gathering spiritual strength, which is not lightly done, so that when the " return " comes to be made—as an individual Paul or Mahomet made it after solitary meditations—it may not be empty-handed but carry with it something of great political worth.

At present it is more important for Liberals to think than to seek allies. The argument for a party of principle against one of interest falls to the ground if the principle can no longer be understood or declared. It is not enough for Liberals to state their faith in such general truths as these: that the human person is of supreme importance and that although he can realize himself only in community yet he must never be sacrificed as an individual to the commun-

ty's needs, except by his free choice; that human dignity demands the free exercise of responsibility; that personal creativeness in work and leisure is natural to the children of God and that when they are denied outlets for this faculty they become less than men. These are great truths which have sprung out of western history and men are returning to them with a new interest and awareness. But stating them is not the whole duty of the Liberal party. They need to be brought down to earth and applied, or rather, as the power to apply them is presently lacking, the promise of application should stand clearly in the party's programme. This application of their principles in the changed conditions of to-day is the most urgent task facing Liberals, but it is, on the whole, a duty that is not being well performed.

Liberal energies ought to be turned to discovering how personal freedom, responsibility and creativeness may be realised in industrial society. Planning must be accepted; how is it to be democratically controlled? The vote every five years, for which Liberals fought, is not enough; a plan, once made, has successive Governments in its grip. The best means of controlling democratically a national plan need deep consideration, and much can be learnt only from experience, but informed popular discussion and criticism of a new plan will be essential before it is adopted, as will also be some devolution of its administration when launched. Discussion of plans has been invited by Government in the system of White Papers developed during the war. But in most of the debate, as, for instance, over the White Papers introducing the Education and Health Services Bills, it cannot be said that the general public, as the consumer of the new services to be provided at its expense, had a greatly influential part. It is an Athenian democracy that makes a clear division between the " freemen " at the top—in our society the official experts and the professional interests—and the others at the bottom who must take what they are given for their good. Liberals need a policy for adult education, for only an informed people can contribute valuably to the critical discussion which should precede every national plan.

For the proper devolution of a plan's administration new representative bodies, with a recognized place in the structure, seem to be needed. In a large city even the council is remote, and, beyond that, every citizen should himself carry some social responsibility. Faint traces of these new representative bodies may be seen in the tenants' associations which exist on some housing estates and the parents-teachers associations for some schools. These are the institutions, rising from the neighbourhood and able to meet one day in the promised community centres, which could be made to carry some of the administration of a national plan. Fostering their growth and ensuring their power demands first a realization of their importance, then a study of the work they might do, and some grasp of how to persuade an apathetic people why it needs doing at all.

More important than this is to ask how in the field of modern industry a

sense of pride and responsibility in his work may be given to the ordinary man. Discontent with work, through which a man makes his greatest contribution to society, is one of the diseases of our time. Mr. C. G. Renold, the chairman of the new British Institute of Management, has spoken of the need for an "idea of social purpose in industry." Where lies the idea that will set men in Britain once more contentedly to work? It may well be asked why such an idea should be expected, when in the average factory the worker has no sense of ownership or of freedom, where he is asked to carry no form of responsibility, where he is as much a tool as the machine he tends, and has been stripped of every one of those attributes of human dignity for which the Liberal party above all others is supposed to stand. The fine principles of Liberalism seem to have no bearing on industrial life as they are phrased to-day, and the worker may not be despised for judging them so many windy words before the shorter hours and solid benefits which he sees as coming to him from the Labour Party.

It is true that here at least some Liberals have dallied, as even the Conservatives are beginning in their extremity to do, with schemes of co-partnership and profit-sharing combined with an association of workers with management. We may even expect a statement of party policy along these lines. But a policy to restore to the worker some sense of ownership in his place of work, in the tools he uses, and in the product of his hands, and so to right the wrong done at the outset of the factory economy, requires more than statement; it needs careful working out. A policy that depends on exhortation and not on legislation will carry no electoral weight. The Socialists had their idea of common ownership—a fiction, for ownership fades into legal abstraction, without any personal content, when it embraces anything so large as a whole industry—but they had at least some specific plans, as well as many foreign examples, for putting it into practice. Such plans for restoring a real share in ownership to the worker in the only sphere in which it can mean anything to him—his factory unit—the Liberals do not yet possess.

Nor, if they are asked: "What is freedom in education?" or: "What is the freedom proper to a university?", have they clear answers, and if similar questions were put to them about other branches of the national activity on many they would have to stay silent. It is not enough for them to reply that other parties are equally barren in inspiration and that all together are entering the planning age with the haziest ideas of what—beyond purely material advancement—it is likely to bring them and of what it is likely to destroy. The Liberal party calls itself the party of freedom, and in days when all we understand by that word is threatened it should be earnest in its defence. What is wanted to-day is a new idea of freedom, working out naturally in the details of policy, which will draw after it the minds and hearts of men in the same way that the false ideas of nationalism in Germany and of materialist Communism in Russia seized upon the peoples of those countries. For freedom to appear attractive it needs, like nationalism, an enemy. In the last century it

ad an enemy worth fighting—privilege—but that enemy was broken more han a few years ago, and for want of an enemy freedom lost something of its ppeal. To-day a new enemy is rising in the bureaucratically planning State, nd the cause of freedom, again possessing something to fight, is taking on new tature. It needs to have its marching orders clearly framed.

There are men and women now within the Liberal party, and young people oining it, who are ready to take up the challenge delivered to it by the times. These are willing to witness to their faith in the western tradition even if it hould cost them place and mean that they are perhaps condemned for their wn short lives to be no more than the ineffectual critics of a continuing in- atuate desertion of society's higher goods. But they believe also that the pportunities of politics are constantly changing, and that the day may not be o far distant when the real issues (instead of faintly ridiculous arguments rom principle for or against nationalization) are grasped by the people, and n uncompromised party which is tied to no interest below that of the whole ommunity may come into a greater influence than it has known during years n which no one can say the country has fared well.

Meanwhile loyalty is as much needed as hard thought. It has been possible o indicate here only one or two of the fields in which a practical reinterpreta- ion of what freedom means is urgently required. For this work to be done lemands from Liberals a sacrifice of time to study and to group-work which is ar from easy in these days. If they attempt it thoroughly, they will have enough on their hands. How much, then, should it be deplored that some Liberals of ability, instead of addressing themselves to a task of this sort, are spending their energies in a weak caballing with Conservatives in the hope of gaining that power, so long denied them, which they would not know how o use valuably if they won. To scheme for power without striving to deserve t, to think of electoral arrangements instead of electoral policies, to talk about freedom in general without bringing it down to particular applications—all these courses pursued by a small body of Liberals can bring them no more credit than they will advantage. It is assuredly no way to spend a time in which Liberalism's greatest struggle is opening fast.

(*The author was the Liberal candidate for Bury at the General Election of* 1945 *and is now the prospective Liberal candidate for the same constituency.*)

THE PLANNING BILL

By Henry W. Wells

WHENEVER I have been asked to explain the compensation-betterment problem I have advised the inquirer to read the Uthwatt Report. The analysis made by the Uthwatt Committee is as lucid as the complexity of the problem permits. A study of the Report's 180 pages is therefore the quickest method of obtaining the necessary background to a proper understanding of the Planning Bill; there is, I am afraid, no short cut. It would therefore be idle for me to pretend that in a few words I can explain to the reader the defects and deficiencies in the existing law. I hope, however, that he is already convinced by the evidence of his own eyes that something is wrong with the present town planning system; that he is shocked when he sees housing estates developing in clearly inappropriate places like red rashes on our rural beauty; that he is ashamed whenever he sees the dirty, treeless, monotonous grey of our industrial towns or the East End of London, and that he is alarmed by the degeneracy of our architecture. If he is not, he will not be interested in what I have to say in the remainder of this article.

The Uthwatt Report's analysis of the faults and deficiencies of the existing law are in general accepted by the experts. The solutions proposed by the Committee have, on the other hand, been the subject of considerable argument and debate. In my opinion the Committee were too much influenced by their view of what was politically possible at the time of writing the Report (1942), and too little by the administrative difficulties and complexities which they must have foreseen would arise out of the acceptance of the solutions proposed. But above all the Report established beyond further doubt that the existing town planning law is unsatisfactory because this law has developed within the financial limitations imposed, first by the necessity of paying the landowner compensation if his land is depreciated as a result of public control or enterprise, and secondly by the difficulty of proving and collecting betterment if his land has appreciated for the same reason. A solution to the twin problem of compensation and betterment is therefore a necessary preliminary to putting town planning law on to a workable basis, which the Bill effectively does. As the Uthwatt solutions were not accepted, either by the Coalition or this Government, because of the difficulty of fitting them into an administrative framework, it is not necessary to refer to them.

Land nationalization, sometimes suggested as the easiest solution, is also administratively impossible. The Bill is, nevertheless, a first step towards

ne ultimate goal of State ownership of the freehold interest in land, and Mr. Dalton blessed it as such in Parliament.

How does the Bill solve the compensation-betterment problem? What will be the practical effect of the solution? These are the questions to which many people require an answer.

In the first place the Bill places a restriction on all land so that it cannot be developed nor its present use changed without permission. In other words, the landowner loses for all time any right in law or equity which he might now have to use his property according to his fancy. Certain obvious exceptions have had to be allowed, for example buildings "connected with the general farming operations" which are required on a farm, and small additions to existing buildings are permitted.

The Government do not admit, indeed by implication they refute the suggestion, that the owner of land has any prescriptive right to use his property according to his fancy. By taking this viewpoint, which is open to doubt, they justify the contention that they need not compensate the owner for any loss which he may suffer because he is prevented from using his land as he wishes. On the other hand they admit that some owners will suffer hardship as a result of this universal restriction, and so £300,000,000 is to be set aside and distributed in five years according, we are told, to the extent of the hardship suffered. I am no lawyer, and cannot therefore comment on the legal soundness of the argument on which this attitude is founded. Nevertheless, I suspect that a legal "nice point" has been deliberately introduced, either to confuse the issue for political reasons, or to surmount some drafting or administrative difficulty.

There is no doubt at all that owners have always in the past sold their land on a basis that assumes considerable freedom about the use to which it can be put, and prices of land consequently reflect the chances of development. Furthermore, under existing town planning and similar legislation any measurable infringement of that freedom has in practice been regarded as compensable, although Mr. Silkin tried to argue to the contrary. His arguments reminded me of the saying: "*Qui s'excuse s'accuse.*" While Mr. Dalton admitted that the figure of £300,000,000 had no logical basis, Mr. Silkin went out of his way to defend it with a display of logics having about as much foundation as those used by Mr. Maskelyne or Mr. Devant. He even tried to justify the £300,000,000 as being sufficient to cover the loss to landowners regarding them as a class, not individually; in other words, that it represented Uthwatt's "global sum" as applied to developed and undeveloped land. Why, therefore, it may be asked, does the White Paper on the Bill find it necessary to contend that "owners who lose development value as a result of the passing of the Bill are not on that account entitled to compensation"? The true reason for this attitude is surely as follows.

The absence of any satisfactory basis on which to assess the total amount

of the "global sum" (Uthwatt's method is administratively impossible if applied to developed as well as undeveloped land) forced the Government in the interest of prudent finance, and having regard to the demands on the Exchequer, to limit the total amount of compensation to be paid out. Once having made that decision they had to fall back on the doubtful argument that the owner was not entitled to compensation "of right", because they had no means of telling whether the £300,000,000 would be sufficient to meet the loss of the "right" or not. Either the right of the owner to compensation had to be admitted, in which case the amount to be paid out was unlimited, or the amount had to be limited, in which case no right to compensation could be allowed. If, therefore, the real reason for not admitting the landowners' loss as compensable was that Governments should not sign blank cheques, I do not quarrel with it. Nor can the figure chosen be disputed for there is no means of checking its accuracy. Nevertheless, the Government have not been frank about the reasons that led them arbitrarily to choose a figure.

It would have been more honest if the Government had stated that the national finances did not justify a greater sum than £300,000,000 being gambled on this venture, rather than to have argued that their guess was a fair one to landowners, a contention which certainly has not convinced the landowner that he was having a fair deal.

How the £300,000,000 will be distributed we are not yet informed, for the Bill leaves this important point to regulations. It is to be hoped that a scheme is devised which distributes the amount on an "out-of-pocket basis", that the criterion of hardship is related to an actual cash loss suffered by the landowner as distinct from a loss in land value. For example, a man who purchased land before the Bill was published at a price which included development value will suffer a cash loss on the Bill becoming law, and should therefore be more generously treated than the man who has inherited land near a large town, which he may have no intention of developing because he wishes to reside there, although development value is attached to it. Another example of a cash loss would be where death duties have been paid on development value.

Having appropriated the development rights in all land, the responsibility of fixing "development charges" whenever permission to develop is granted is handed over to a specially created Central Land Board. The Board will have a difficult task, for in many cases there will be no established criteria on which to base the amount of the charge. Where and when the development charges are to be collected, and to a considerable extent their amount, will depend upon the planning authority, that is—the County or County Borough. The Board will not, as far as can be judged from the Bill, be in a position to function as if it owned an interest in land, because the more important functions of land ownership and development such as the nature and size of

he buildings to be erected will be outside its control. Yet the Board should, ccording to Mr. Silkin, be in the same position as " an owner of land who s negotiating a building lease to an intending developer." Mr. Silkin's idea f how the Board will function does not therefore fit in with the Bill's con- eption. Under existing law an owner of land who is negotiating a building ease has a very considerable say in the nature, size and form of the building o be erected by the lessee, indeed these factors play a considerable part in letermining the ground rent to be paid. The owner of land is thus in a osition at the present time to balance the immediate financial return to be ained against other merits of the development such as the benefit to the emainder of his estate; a wise ground landlord will do this, but the Land oard is not empowered to emulate him. There is, therefore, a danger that he Board will degenerate into another tax collecting organization, the amount f the tax being in effect substantially fixed by the planning authorities when hey make their planning decisions.

Furthermore, as planning authorities are not directly concerned about the mount of the development charge, they may be tempted to encourage develop- ent which although excellent from a theoretical planning aspect is disastrous rom the development charge point of view. If this should happen to any xtent, the scheme by which it is proposed to recover the £300,000,000 over wenty years by the collection of development charges will be bankrupted in s early stages.

Good planning should take account of finance, yet the Bill places planning n the hands of one authority and the financial implications of planning ecisions in the hands of another. I am not opposed to the proposal of a entral Land Board. The arguments in favour of centralizing both the dis- ribution of the £300,000,000 and the collection of the development charges re overwhelming, but I do suggest that the Bill should provide for a simple dministrative link between the planning authorities and the Board, which would at least enable the Board's financial outlook to play its proper part in lanning decisions. The Board must be a live body, but to be this its unctions must not be limited to accountancy, nor must it be strangled by the reasury or a Treasury outlook. Some machinery must be provided which nables it to function in practice as a ground landlord. This could have been argely achieved if the Board was a central purchasing authority which bought nd held all publicly owned land, but no doubt this was considered and turned own as being too damaging to the status of local authorities.

It is true that the Board on the Minister's authorization has powers to pur- hase land with the object of disposing of it for development, but not holding t. This would seem to be a reserve power by which the Minister is able, hrough the Central Land Board, to step in and secure development in any ase where the local authority is not anxious to take this course for political easons. It would not appear to give the Board any real say in planning

policy or decisions.

It would be out of place in this article to examine in detail the new planning system proposed by the Bill, and only possible because the Bill provides a solution to the compensation-betterment problem. In general, however, the proposed new system has met with approbation. The transfer of planning functions to the larger units of local government is welcomed as sensible. The obligation to prepare a development plan within three years, and review it every five years, is undoubtedly theoretically good, but may break down because of shortage of technical man-power.

The success of the new planning system depends almost wholly on the wise use of the compulsory purchase powers granted to local authorities by the Bill. The strengthening of these powers and their use became necessary as a result of the solution to the compensation-betterment problem. This is so for the following reasons.

Whereas under the existing law the driving force which normally brought about new development was generated by private enterprise, under the system proposed in the Bill it must in future be generated by the local authorities. This is so because by appropriating the development value of all the land, the State have removed the incentive of the landowner to sell his land for development. "Why", the owner will say, "should I sell my farm for house building when I shall only be paid its farm value? For all I know its value may increase as farm land. I will therefore hang on to it."

Before the war building land was continuously available because there were always owners anxious to "cash in" on their development value. Under the Bill this value, or at any rate the greater portion of it, is collected by the State by way of development charge. It follows that when the Bill becomes law land may more often than not have to be made available by compulsion. Thus some machinery had to be included in the Bill to take the place of the profit incentive which previously made land available for development. The Bill solves this difficulty by very substantially increasing the powers of compulsory acquisition, by empowering planning authorities to "designate" land as "subject to compulsory purchase" in their development plans, and generally enabling land to be purchased by public authorities with as much ease as possible. Once the land has passed into public ownership the freehold will normally remain publicly held, the developer taking a lease of the land from the local authority. It is therefore probable that in future most new development will take place on publicly owned land, although the agency for the actual development may still be largely private enterprise.

The compulsory purchase powers could be used as a threat to force owners to sell direct to developers. Personally, I would rather see local authorities face up to their responsibilities and buy the land required for development, than use the acquisition powers given to them as a form of blackmail, a course which might easily lead to widespread chicanery.

I should not like to feel that any comments made here give the impression hat taken as a whole the Bill is a bad measure. Such criticisms as I have are lirected for the most part towards its short term effect, although the Bill is by ts very nature concerned primarily with a long term problem. The part of he Bill with which this article is mostly concerned—the solution to the com- ɔensation-betterment problem—provides for a preliminary surgical operation which is bound, I believe, however carefully performed, to hurt and leave ɔome sort of scar. But once this initial necessary operation has been carried ɔut, the way is opened to the growth of a healthy and relatively simple plan- ıing administration. The Bill provides what is necessary by way of legislation :o enable our towns to be decently planned, and our countryside suitably ɔrotected against spoliation in the years of national reconstruction ahead, although improvements in detail can, and no doubt will, be made in Com- mittee. But there remains unsolved the problem of finding capable techni- cians to ensure that the planning itself as well as its administration is efficient.

Mr. Silkin has proved himself to be a realistic Planning Minister; he is master of his subject. But it must be emphasized that the statutory planning machine which he is creating, however excellent it may be, will break down with disturbing results unless the technicians both locally and centrally can be found quickly enough in quality and quantity. That this will be impossible is the greatest fear.

Finally—the passing of the Bill into law should, in view of its importance and effect on every aspect of our national life, entitle the Planning Minister to be raised to Cabinet rank. The Ministry of Town and Country Planning cannot function as the "central Planning Authority" unless it is represented in the Cabinet, and not just called in for consultation.

(Mr. H. W. Wells, F.S.I., F.A.I., is a partner in the well-known firm of Chesterton & Sons, the surveyors and estate agents, and was formerly chief Estates Adviser to the Ministry of Town and Country Planning.)

SOME CRITICISMS OF THE CURTIS REPORT

By Lady Allen of Hurtwood

A rich patron was presenting prizes to the children in a Home. "How beautiful," she said, "they all look alike; they might be one child."

THE long awaited Curtis Report was signed in August 1946 and published in the middle of September. It has been very widely read; nearly 27,000 copies have been printed by the Stationery Office, but the comments have been strangely few. Most of the articles and reports in the press have merely summarized the Report.

Before making my comments I should like to mention a few of the changes that occurred after the public agitation started in July 1944, and before the Report was published. The tragedy of this story is that local authorities and voluntary homes should have needed a public outburst of indignation to cause them, so hurriedly, to attempt to put their houses in order.

Since July 1944 a large number of voluntary organizations and Homes have changed their name. The Charity Organization Society is now the Family Welfare Association; the Waifs and Strays is now the Church of England Children's Society (I have not yet been able to discover what connection they have with the Church of England which entitles them to this name); the Foundling Hospital for illegitimate children is now Coram's Fields; the Gordon Boys Home and Orphanage and the Albert Boys School and Orphanage have both dropped the "Orphanage", and so the long list goes on.

One heavily endowed Charity abolished the conspicuous and regimented dress worn by the children and clothed them like human beings. One opened its gates and allowed the children to enjoy ordinary school holidays, for the first time since its foundation, with the foster parents with whom they had lived until they were five years old. Yet another had gone so far as to appoint, for the first time, I believe, certificated teachers on to its school staff. The Home Office at least doubled its Inspectorate.

A more tangible improvement could be noticed in the change of heart and the whole spirit in which the problem surrounding these children was being tackled by local committees and organizations. There was a great outpouring of generous offers of help from the public, many offered to act as "Uncles" and "Aunts", others to work with the children, and to set up small family homes. The London County Council, writing to a potential "Uncle" said: "*All* the children concerned in the Council's residential schools and Children's

Homes now have Aunties or Uncles." (My italics).

There is a fine feeling for children running like a thread throughout the Curtis Report: I welcome the great humaneness and understanding, but I cannot welcome all the recommendations. To my mind they fall far short of what is needed, and it is unfortunate that this golden opportunity to suggest far-reaching reforms was not more bravely taken.

In making my comments I do not wish to attempt to assess the merits or the demerits of the care given by local authorities or by voluntary organizations. The Report is very favourably inclined to the voluntary organizations and the weight of its indictment is quite definitely thrown against the local authorties. On page 27 it can be seen that apart from homeless evacuees and the ineducable mentally disordered, there appear to be approximately 31,000 children cared for in "Local Authority Institutions" and 39,000 in "Voluntary Homes and Hospitals", and yet the Report devotes forty pages to the local authority Homes and only seventeen to the voluntary organization Homes. The summing up of its attitude to the voluntary organizations can be found in Para. 233, which says: "If in *any degree* the voluntary Homes fail in their special purpose, it is in giving too much weight to *traditional* methods and too little to the modern outlook in child-care." (My italics). And yet, when speaking of the voluntary organizations these sentences also occur: "The Homes which attempt to split their children into groups, especially family groups, were few." (Para. 233). "The encouragement of friendships and acquaintanceships outside the Home is still found infrequently and in some Homes the children were not allowed or not encouraged to join outside organizations." (Para. 256).

I believe that there are certain principles that should govern the care of *all* children who have lost their home back-ground, whether they are in the care of a local authority or of a voluntary organization. The Report does not recommend equal safeguards for both groups of children. Those under the care of a voluntary organization are excluded from many of the recommendations.

The first principle is that they must be given a stable and secure status within the State. Every child who has lost his home background should have a legal guardian appointed by a Court. This is not so to-day. The Curtis Committee suggest that the local authority should be the legal guardian of the children under its care, if a suitable relation or other person is not available. (Para. 425 ii). They also suggest, however, that the Head of an approved voluntary Home should be appointed the legal guardian to the children under the care of a voluntary organization. (Para. 425 ii). This legal-binding of a child to a voluntary organization is, I am sure, wrong in principle. The whole essence of our desires for these children is that they should be placed in the environment most suited to their needs. A voluntary organization may be so limited in its provision that it cannot have the diverse facilities available, and the child may

therefore suffer through lack of opportunity or by unsuitable placing. And consider this further point. Para. 65 says "*A large proportion* of the children who have no homes of their own are cared for by charitable organizations." (My italics). Many voluntary organizations refuse to allow their children to be adopted or to be boarded out, and since these two methods are the type of care most strongly recommended by the Curtis Committee, it would indeed be tragic if children under the care of some of the voluntary organizations should be denied the opportunity of living in a normal family group. I maintain that every child who has no natural or testamentary guardian, wherever placed, should become a ward of the community and that all the safeguards devised for local authority children should apply equally to the children under the care of voluntary organizations. The second principle is that one Government Department should be responsible for the supervision and welfare of the children and should initiate forward-looking policies. This principle has now been fully accepted by the country, the Government and the Curtis Committee (Recommendation 5). It is interesting to recall that during the lifetime of the Coalition Government, which went out of office in June 1945 before the Curtis Committee had got under way, all political parties had then agreed that one Government Department should be responsible, although no announcement was made in the House of Commons.

I do not like the recommendation that an *ad hoc* committee be set up to solve the confusion, at the local authority end (Recommendation 14). I should prefer to see the proposed Children's Officer appointed to the staff of the Director of Education. The realistic solution is probably to invite each local authority to submit their own scheme. The setting up of an *ad hoc* committee would tend to create a kind of vested interest in deprived children. The Education Committee should be more interested in doing away with the causes which lead to deprivation and, consequently, would regard the fewness of deprived children as a testimonial to the efficiency of their work.

The third principle is that the entire maintenance cost of all wards of the community (and that, in my opinion, should include all the children under review) should be borne by the exchequer. There can be no equality of opportunity if these children have to depend, as at present, on the poverty or wealth of a County or County Borough, or upon the poverty or wealth of a voluntary organization. In Para. 228 occurs this sentence: "Financial stringency, however, often limits the amenities that the independent Home is able to offer." The fate of these children should no longer continue to rest on parochialism or on charity. I therefore disagree with the section in Para. 432 of the Curtis Report which says: "We assume that all the various services to the deprived child will in future be subject to exchequer *grant* and that this will relieve difficulties arising from the small financial resources of certain *authorities*" (my italics). The voluntary organizations are not, it appears, included in the grant.

The Committee attach great importance to establishing and maintaining

continuing personal relations between the child and the official of the local authority responsible for looking after him. (Para. 445). They therefore recommend the appointment of a Children's Officer of high standing and qualifications. They go so far as to say that: "This may indeed be said to be our solution of the problem referred to us" (Para. 441). It is therefore surprising to find that this person, whom the Committee call the "pivot" of the whole organization, is not to have the same individual relationship to children under the care of voluntary organizations. Why should these children not enjoy the safeguard and the individual interest of the Children's Officer? The Report suggests that voluntary organizations should appoint their own officers, but that is a very different matter. The Children's Officer of the local authority will have all the weight and authority of the central Government to back her up, for her appointment will be subject to approval by them. This will not be so in the case of the Officers appointed by the voluntary organizations.

The fourth principle is that every child should, as far as possible, be absorbed into the full life of the community. There is much to say on this all-important problem, but I must content myself with a few passing observations.

The method of care most preferred by the Curtis Committee is adoption. This we should all agree is probably the best method of absorbing these children into the community. It is all the more distressing, therefore, to find that the Committee do not urge, with all the weight of their authority, that children under the care of voluntary organizations should be entitled to this form of care. They go so far as to say "that voluntary Homes specializing in one form of child care should not be pressed to change to another." This can only mean that a voluntary organization will still be free to refuse to allow their children to be adopted or boarded out, if they so desire. "*One or two* of the large organizations had instituted a system of boarding out" (my italics: Para. 230) but "others (for example, the National Children's Home and the Catholic Child Welfare Council) differ from the general run of opinion in being averse from doing so as a general policy" (Para. 460). The Scottish Report on Homeless Children (Cmd 6811) known as the Clyde Report, says in paragraph 13: "There appears to be little or no boarding out with foster parents by voluntary Societies" even though this has always been a distinctive feature of Scottish Poor Law administration. And the Curtis Report when speaking of some of the Homes managed by endowed voluntary organizations, says: "In these Homes the children may be kept away from any outside contact or advice for the whole of their childhood . . ." (Para. 229) and in Para. 420: "We found in the children in the foster homes we visited almost complete freedom from the sense of deprivation which we have described among the children in Homes." And yet in Para. 465 they urge that: "A vigorous effort to extend the boarding out system for children in the care of *local authorities* should in our view be made . . ." Why should not the same effort be made for the children in voluntary Homes?

In the annual report of one of the thirty-four registered Adoption Societies I see that they received ten to twenty applications a day in 1946 from would-be adopters, many of whom they say " were eminently suitable ". That is anything from 2,500 to 5,000 applications a year from would-be adopters to one Society only. Yet this Society only effects 330 adoptions a year. Is it from lack of suitable children? Surely that cannot be so, when our Homes and Institutions are full, and there are a thousand illegitimate births every week.

Boarding out with foster parents has many dangers, as we all know. A child placed with foster parents has no certainty that the arrangement will be permanent. He may prove unsuitable or the foster parent may, from personal reasons, wish to be free of the liability. In either case the child may feel little sense of security. In regard to life in Homes the Committee say: " The result in many Homes was a lack of personal interest in and affection for the children which we found shocking. In the older children the effect appeared more in slowness, backwardness and lack of response, and in habits of destructiveness and want of concentration " (Para. 418).

The Committee say they would like to reduce to the lowest limit the number of institutions. A quotation from the recently published Memorandum on Boarding out of Children and Young Persons (Home Office and Ministry of Health, December 12, 1946) passes this reflection on residential Homes:

> Foster parents must also be prepared sometimes to find the child lacking in knowledge of the proper use of leisure or property and in respect for the property of other people. *This applies particularly to children who have been for a considerable time in a residential Home where food, clothing and toys are bought and stored centrally.* Such ordinary things in the foster home as kitchen equipment or cupboards may give rise to a curiosity, which may be misunderstood. It will therefore be wise for the foster parent to show the child in the first few days where things are kept and how they work. **(My italics).**

If this pathetic isolation from the day-by-day affairs of the community is apparent when the children are young, imagine the plight of these children when they are turned out into the world at fourteen or fifteen to " face the unknown battle of life " with no one to show them " where things are kept and how they work."

The Curtis Committee say: " The disadvantages of institutional life can be minimized by the development of the family group system in grouped cottage homes . . ." To my mind grouped cottage homes should be abolished root and branch, except possibly for the " ins and outs " of public assistance. They never can provide the environment that will help the children to become part of the full life of the community. In these artificial villages, the children and the staff are often shut off from the outside community in a world of their own and when many deprived children are grouped together in this way it cannot be possible to allow them the freedom enjoyed by normally placed children. Para. 486 says: " 43 per cent. of the children in local authority Homes in 1939 were in grouped Homes." These communities may secure healthy bodies, but

ney can never secure healthy minds. There can be no justification, beyond dministrative convenience, for using this system a day longer than we need.

As long ago as 1893 grouped cottage homes, which were originally evolved or the "ins and outs" of public assistance, were publicly condemned. The heffield Authority then said that "they wished to avoid the fundamental defect f congregating together one class of children by removing them from contact with the world in which they would afterwards have to live." (Dame Henrietta Barnett's *Life of Canon Barnett*.) Sheffield were, I believe, the first authority to evolve the small scattered home as an improvement on the grouped ottage home, and, in their opinion, an improvement on boarding out. That vas fifty years ago! Of grouped Children's Homes the Report says: "They epresent . . . . the normal method of caring for children in the charge of ublic Assistance authorities and not boarded out" (Para. 157).

Recommendation 44 of the Curtis Report reads:

> Deprived children suited to a boarding school education who are sent to local authority boarding schools set up under the Education Act of 1944, should have a foster home to go to for the holidays.

To my mind the Report does not give sufficient emphasis or recommend with any great conviction a scheme which might well be found to be of great importance, namely, the combination of a fine type of boarding school with a free family life during the holidays. Such schools should, of course, include as far as possible, many types of children for whom education at a boarding school is considered desirable by their parents. The new Education Act gives local education authorities special power to set up boarding schools (Section 3, Clause 2 (d)). Every child in these boarding schools should have, if there are no relatives, what I call a part-time guardian, to act as his personal friend. These guardians would be very different from the uncle and aunt scheme, about which I am not too happy. They would welcome their young friend into the family circle for all holidays, would write to and visit him frequently, help to launch him into the world, and provide a continuing background of affection and stability throughout his life. They should be selected by the Head of the school or by the Children's Officer and be registered with the Central Department. I believe there would be a great response to a scheme of this kind from people who are not in a position to be full-time foster parents or adoptive parents.

An endless variety of excellent boarding schools, some for boys, some for girls, some co-educational and some large and some small, could be created by some of the wealthier organizations and by the local authorities. The Curtis Report says:

> Some existing orphanages and similar institutions of the 'barrack' type where education is given on the premises, seem eminently suitable for use as boarding schools.

It is impossible to imagine the 'barrack' type of school being converted into the splendid school I have in mind.

The whole problem is a complex one, and I have only been able to touch the

fringe of the subject. What we must all strive for is to give individual care and justice to every homeless child, within a continually extending framework of social provision and help that will prevent these children ever becoming homeless. Perhaps we should launch another campaign to demand an inquiry into the reasons why so many children are deprived of a normal home life, and what steps should be taken to prevent this tragic state of affairs.

* * * *

Some relevant dates.

1547.	Nov.	8.	First entry in House of Commons Journal, Vol. 1, page 1, line 1. The Bill for bringing up of poor men's children.
1896.	April		Report of Departmental Committee set up to inquire into Conditions of State Supported Children in Barrack Schools, Grouped Cottage Homes, Scattered Homes and Boarded out.
	Nov.		State Children's Association formed: "To obtain individual treatment for children under the Guardianship of the State."
1905.			Appointment of Royal Commission on the Poor Law.
1944.	July	15.	Lady Allen of Hurtwood's letter to *The Times* asking for an inquiry into the care of children deprived of a normal home life.
	Nov.	14.	John Watson's statement on L.C.C. Remand Homes.
		24.	Russell Vick and Myra Curtis appointed to consider and report on the provision of Remand Homes made by the L.C.C.
	Dec.	7.	Government announced they would set up an official inquiry into conditions of children deprived of a normal home life (Hansard).*
1945.	Jan.	9.	Death of Dennis O'Neill.
		29.	Report published on L.C.C. Remand Homes (Cmd 6594).
	Feb.	2.	Publication of "Whose Children?" by Lady Allen of Hurtwood.
		22.	Care of Children Committee appointed (Curtis Committee) (Hansard).
	Mar.	28.	Sir Walter Monckton appointed to investigate Dennis O'Neill's death.
	May	8.	Report published on Dennis O'Neill's case (Cmd 6636).
1946.	March		Interim Report from Care of Children Committee (Curtis) on Training of Child Care (Cmd 6760).
	April		Publication of Report of Scottish Committee on Homeless Children (Cmd 6911).
	Sept.		Report Care of Children Committee (Curtis) (Cmd 6922).
	Dec.		Memorandum on Boarding Out of Children and Young Persons (Home Office and Ministry of Health).

* During the debates on the Curtis Report in the House of Commons (November 19, 1946) and the House of Lords (December 12, 1946) both Mr. Wilson Harris, M.P. and Lord Iddesleigh said that the Curtis Committee was set up as a result of the death of Dennis O'Neill. Dennis O'Neill died a month after the Government announcement.

CAN UNESCO SUCCEED?

By Stephen Spender

DR. JULIAN HUXLEY, the newly appointed Director General of UNESCO is an evolutionist. He has been criticized for putting forward his own evolutionary philosophy as the philosophy of UNESCO. Whether or not one feels that evolutionism is too narrow a view for an organization which should include all the creeds of all the nations of the world, it is simple and useful to regard UNESCO itself as a phase in the evolution of a modern international society. The world (let us for this purpose assume) is moving towards a phase of world government. But world government, when it is achieved, probably will not resemble the centralized government by political parties which we mean by government to-day, thinking, as we do, of the examples of national government which we see around us.

World government may rather be the development of many international organizations, working on parallel lines, which will create conditions of co-operation between nations wherever co-operation is helpful and necessary. To take one example, the world seems to be on the verge of a new industrial revolution as the result of the harnessing of atomic energy. This is an extremely dramatic example, because the useful development of atomic energy is only possible if there is a great deal of co-operation between nations, and its destructive use would destroy on the widest international scale, our civilization. Other examples of international organizations of world government which are developing are those for the world distribution of food and economic planning.

One can imagine that the history of these newly emerging social forms, written in five hundred years' time, might be very Huxleyan. It would be the history of vast organizations with strange names such as AMGOT, UNRRA, UNESCO, crawling out of the cerebral dens of a Wellsian world brain, to grow, expand, become too vast, too bloated, and then be thrown aside by the evolutionary history process and replaced by smaller, more efficient forms.

Yet looking ahead in this way, one may hazard the guess that world government will not mean political, centralized government from one place. It will mean rather the development of many organizations, many inter-nations, to increase the inter-relatedness of nations for the purpose of world co-operation to ensure peace and to enable each nation to take part in a development which is only possible now to each nation if there is such international co-operation. What we are beginning to see already is that such international co-operation is not exclusively political, in the limited modern sense of politics. The nations

of the world might to-day agree to differ on politics and yet find enormous fields of development in which they could co-operate: in rehabilitation, in economics, in scientific development in education, in culture. To some extent, such a development is, indeed, taking place; international co-operation gets stuck in purely political controversy, yet moves forward in certain concrete tasks of rehabilitation, and also, to some extent, in cultural relations. Of course, there are stages where all kinds of international relations become ideological, and therefore political. For example, the conflict between the ideas of the East and the West entered considerably into the General Conference of UNESCO at Paris in December 1946: and the absence of the Soviet Union from the membership of UNESCO dramatizes this conflict. Yet nevertheless it remains true that where, in political discussion, there would be perhaps a complete impasse, in UNESCO, there is an interchange of ideas between East and West, and that in this interchange there lies hope of future understanding.

Thus UNESCO is an experiment towards one of those international organizations which, in their perfected forms, may take place in the world of the future as inter-nations, existing as links in a world where there are still separate nationalities, but where each nation uses these international organs for giving and receiving in the interest of the whole world.

We must regard the present stage of the world's history as a painful period of transition, corresponding to the phase of the industrial revolution in England at the beginning of the nineteenth century. But it is a much wider revolution, affecting far larger populations, and coming after a period of even greater disaster than that which followed the Napoleonic wars. The word 're-education' which we have designated for the Germans is really the label applying to our whole world: and the history lessons of lived history are taught with blood and tears.

Therefore I do not regard an organization such as UNESCO as an end, and I do not subscribe to such opinions as: "If UNO or UNESCO fail, then we are lost and there can be no basis of world co-operation." Rather, I regard these organizations as experiments, perhaps to be replaced by other and better organizations, perhaps capable of learning their own lessons and transforming themselves.

UNESCO exists under the Charter of the United Nations which called upon the members of UNO to create such an organization to promote the cause of peace by means of international co-operation in science, education and culture.

During the first prenatal months of its existence UNESCO was a Preparatory Commission drawing up a programme, a plan of action. This programme, presented to the General Conference in December 1946 is an extremely interesting survey of the possible ways in which intellectual collaboration can be organized. It includes plans for rehabilitation, in science, education and culture for countries devastated by war; proposals for world surveys of such problems as illiteracy and certain model scientific projects for introducing tech-

cal machinery into countries where it is lacking; schemes for promoting the anslation of important books into foreign languages; an international theatre stitute; information services in education, science and culture. Several of ese activities are already being carried out, but there are remarkable gaps in ne present system of intellectual exchanges, and there is certainly a great deal hich UNESCO should be able to do.

It is one thing to draw up a programme, it is quite another thing to carry it ut. What UNESCO will be able to do depends on what UNESCO *is*. At ne General Conference held in Paris in December 1946, the nature of the JNESCO organization as it at present exists gradually emerged from the fog f discussion.

What first of all became apparent was the organization situated at Unesco louse in the Avenue Kléber, Paris (formerly the Hotel Majestic, then headuarters of the Gestapo, then headquarters of the U.S. army, now headquarters f the UNESCO secretariat). This secretariat, though it will be known to nost people as UNESCO, is only an instrument, the organ of the National Commissions of the nations belonging to UNESCO. During the conference the lelegates of these commissions formed committees which considered the prorammes for action put forward by the secretariat. The tendency of the committees was to cut down each programme to a minimum of projects which were considered most important, which were realizable within a reasonable amount of time and which were feasible within the limits of what Mr. Benton described as a " fledgling budget ". It also became evident that it was not the wish of the delegates of the General Conference that the secretariat of UNESCO should set themselves up as arbiters of taste. They should carry out their nstructions, given to them by the Executive Committee of the delegates representing the countries belonging to it. Thus (to take an example) it is not the function of the Section of Letters in the secretariat of UNESCO to select what books should be translated from the literature of each country. It is the task of the National Commission of each country to select these books and then to use the machinery of the Section of Letters as an agency for translation into other languages.

The limitation of the Budget to 6,000,000 dollars, and the controversy about the election of the Director General, Dr. Julian Huxley, emphasized still further the fact that the secretariat is not an independent organization, like a broadcasting company, but an instrument of the nations belonging to UNESCO.

Therefore, the limits of UNESCO will be in the first place not the limitations of the secretariat, but those of the nations belonging to UNESCO. And here we are brought face to face with the significance of the U.S.S.R. not belonging to it. For without the U.S.S.R., UNESCO is in danger of becoming or of being represented as the cultural agency of a Western bloc directed against the East. Every effort has been made to induce the U.S.S.R. to come in, but this does not of course obviate the danger of UNESCO becoming a bridgehead

rather than a bridge between the East and the West as long as the U.S.S.R. remains outside.

Another problem which must be stated is that of UNESCO becoming a vast international organism into which each nation projects all that is most academic, average and anaemic in its cultural life. The International Art Exhibition held at the Palais de Tokio in connection with the first General Conference of UNESCO was a useful and alarming example of what happens when officials of many countries combine to produce an international cultural manifestation. Apparently the officials in each country of the world agree that every interest and organization in the country must be represented. They consult all the art organizations and get each to select works by its members. The result is a universal slick averageness amazing to the eye of the beholder. It is as though the officialdom of the world had discovered hundreds of painters all capable of painting the same picture combining the qualities of a discreet academicism with a controlled awareness of the modern. In such an exhibition a surrealist fantasy, a portrait of a general, a still life, all have the air of being the same picture by one official artist.

The International Art Exhibition was, indeed, a minor catastrophe. Of course, this manifestation had no connection with the main tasks of the secretariat, but nonetheless it is a warning that the secretariat may be asked by the national commissions to handle literature and ideas as academic and feeble as the majority of these pictures.

I have explained that the secretariat is simply the instrument of the National Commissions. Nevertheless, it is the men and women working in Unesco House who will in fact be responsible for the success or failure of UNESCO. The Executive Committee can, of course, do nothing without the instrumentality of the secretariat: not only this, but there is as yet no established machinery and routine for carrying out the projects of the Preparatory Commission. The secretariat, having suggested these projects now has to create them in action. The way in which they will be realized depends on the capacity and the human quality of the personnel who are busy with them. A number of projects has been indicated but now the whole machinery for carrying out these tasks, and, indeed the tasks themselves have to be invented. Although it is almost inevitable that there will be a certain academicism about the translations, the exchanges, the lectures, the conferences organized by UNESCO, these things will depend greatly on the spirit of the secretariat itself.

I can illustrate this argument by saying that although UNESCO on the official level represents the National Commissions, one must never forget that if it is to be a living organization, it must also represent the intellectual life of the world. It must represent not just official committees, but also the scientists, the philosophers, the educationists, the musicians, the artists and the poets of all countries of the world. Dr. Carr, in an interesting lecture in Paris during the *Mois de l'Unesco,* said that if UNESCO did not represent in a direct and

rsonal way the aspirations towards better teaching of the small and unknown nool teacher of a Middle West town in the U.S.A., it would have failed. It equally true that if it does not interest in a direct way men such as Picasso d Casals and Eluard, T. S. Eliot and W. H. Auden, Henry Moore and Benmin Britten (to name quite at random a few artists who have shown their terest in public affairs), as well as the foremost scientists and philosophers of e world, it will have failed.

Here again, we are brought back to the problems of the secretariat. For it not to the national committees that the intellectuals of the world will look t to the heads of sections in Unesco House. During the General Conference Paris it became evident already that for Julian Huxley to be Director General UNESCO meant a great deal to the intellectuals of France; but for him to sign and become a member of the Executive Committee of Delegates of ational Commissions, would have meant little or nothing. Some Paris editors literary reviews met me to explain that if there was no member of the ecretariat whom they respected as having an international position in the world letters, they would take no interest in, and expect nothing from, UNESCO.

The personnel of the secretariat is of great importance, because in so far as tellectual life is already to a great extent international, the intellectuals of the parate countries will look not only to their national commissions, but also—nd perhaps far more—to the international Secretariat. It is important therere that men of real distinction and not place-hunters, or people chosen by the ademy-choosing methods of most national commissions, should be represented the highest posts of UNESCO. At the same time, I have to admit that the nditions of work in the secretariat are unfavourable to anyone with serious tellectual work of his own. J. B. Priestley, on his return from the General onference, broadcast that the very thought of the atmosphere of Unesco ouse gave him a headache. The trouble with such an international organiation, with the committees, its meetings of national commissions, its moving bout from one place in the world to another for the General Conference, its hotographers, its intrigues, etc., etc., is that it degenerates rapidly into a kind f journalists' paradise. One should not accept such a degeneration as inevitble, for it would in fact mean that nearly everyone who set any value on his wn individual development, on his own research or creative work would leave r be driven out, to be replaced by officials, journalists and administrators.

The conditions of work of the new international organizations which are pringing up are worthy of study: and as far as I know they have not been tudied at all. Everyone seems to be surprised when international organizations evelop all the symptoms of being international rackets. Yet when one coniders the conditions in which the staffs of UNRRA, UNO, UNESCO, etc. work, it seems almost inevitable that they should tend to become ackets. Many of the most serious people resign or are driven out. Meanhile the temptation offered to adventurers, amateurs, and political failures to

press for jobs in these organizations (if such people need tempting) are considerable. Before the war certain English people used to live abroad to avoid income tax. Now they have the opportunity of joining one of the new internations.

Yet UNESCO must be filled with men and women with a sense of vocation and of mission. Every means should be studied for producing an atmosphere in which concentration, attention and seriousness is possible amongst the staff of the secretariat. It is more important that the heads of sections should live in conditions where they can carry out their work, and retain their own individuality than that they should travel about all over the world like journalists. Everything should be done to combat the centrifugal tendencies of an international organization and to create a centre, without, on the other hand, that centre leading to over-centralization.

Ultimately, it seems to me that the most difficult task of all for UNESCO is the creating of the right conditions in which the staff of the secretariat can carry out its work. It seems also to be the problem of which everyone connected with UNESCO shows the least awareness.

The work of UNESCO is only now beginning. In a year's time, it will still be too early to be either optimistic or pessimistic about it. The success of the organization depends, though, on four conditions being satisfied within the next two or three years. First, it depends on the National Commissions, of whom the organization itself is only the instrument. When the nations of the world are prepared to spend in one year on educational, cultural and scientific relations what they spend in one week on war or the preparation for war, UNESCO will have a strong enough financial backing to achieve quite ambitious projects. It is for the governments of the world to see also that UNESCO does not become an instrument of rivalry between the ideologies of East and West. Secondly, it is essential that within two years UNESCO should have achieved several limited but concrete successes in carrying out projects large enough to impress a world public. Thirdly, it is essential that the secretariat should contain at least a dozen men of first rate ability and with a sense of the mission of UNESCO which will create confidence in an organization which may very well be regarded either with envy or disgust as a bureaucratic racket. Fourthly and lastly, it is essential that UNESCO should be felt not only by governments but by the intellectuals of the world to be an organization which represents that which they consider the highest and best in their intellectual activities, and that it does not lapse into abstract researches or sterile academicism. The organizers at the centre of UNESCO must be vigilant and inspired to achieve these four conditions without which it will fail.

NATIONALISM IN BURMA

By G. W. Keeton

IN no other part of the Far East has the political situation been so completely transformed by the war with Japan as in Burma, for no other country—not even China—has suffered so much from the impact of war. Further, Burmese affairs are greatly influenced by events in India, for whilst in normal times India relies increasingly upon exports of Burmese rice, Burma has a growing problem of Indian immigration, which is provoking increasing restlessness in Burma.

Burmese independence ended in 1885, with the annexation of Upper Burma, during the Viceroyalty of the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava. Thereafter, until 1931, it was administered with India. It therefore participated in the successive constitutional advances which occurred in India down to that date, although throughout the period of association, there was dissatisfaction in Burma at the apparent subordination of Burmese to Indian interests. At the time of the separation in 1931, the British Government declared that Burma's constitutional progress should not be in any way prejudiced by the separation, and the Government of Burma Act of 1935 conferred wide powers of self-government upon Burma. At the same time, a separate Burma Office was established in London. The Burmese, however, have always regarded the Act of 1935 as simply the first instalment of a grant of complete self-government which, they anticipated, would not be too long delayed since there is no communal problem in Burma.

From the time of the war of 1914-18 onwards, as in India and elsewhere in the Far East, nationalism grew steadily in strength in Burma, and tendencies which were apparent elsewhere were reproduced in Burma. The older political leaders in general elected to work with the British to secure Dominion status by successive stages. The younger leaders, some of whom looked expectantly to Moscow, were impatient of delay and distrusted British intentions. In particular, there was dissatisfaction that Defence and External Affairs were not under Burmese control. There was a good deal of talk of " exploitation ", although Burma demonstrably cannot develop her own resources, and much of the wealth arising from British enterprise is applied for the benefit of the Burmese by way of taxation. However, the younger and more extreme nationalists declined to co-operate, and therefore remained in opposition. In 1941, with a Japanese invasion in prospect, the Burmese Prime Minister, U Saw, came to London to ask that Burma should be granted Dominion status as soon

as the war ended. This was refused, and the refusal was not without influence upon the attitude of the Burmese whilst the war was in progress, more especially as the British Government, suspicious of the drift of U Saw's policy, exiled him to Uganda for the three following years.

The Japanese invasion of 1942 therefore gravely complicated a situation that was already difficult. There were undoubtedly many Burmese who remained loyal to the British connection throughout the occupation, but there were also many who collaborated willingly. Moreover, the Japanese posed as liberators of Burma from British imperialism, and in 1943, they gave nominal " independence " to Burma, a Burmese ambassador to Tokyo being appointed. These developments were accepted as recognitions of Burma's sovereign status, but discontent with Japanese control grew steadily. Resistance to the invader became widespread, and it eventually gave rise to the Burmese National Army, led by General Aung San, the leader of the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League, a federation of resistance groups. The Burmese forces were in close contact with the British forces in India, and co-operated with the Fourteenth Army in the brilliant campaign of liberation, which was undertaken in 1945. The work of the Burmese National Army in this campaign earned warm commendation from Lord Mountbatten afterwards, and although its importance should not be exaggerated, it is a factor which cannot be overlooked in considering future arrangements for the defence of Burma.

The rapid rise to power of General Aung San is one of the most significant features of recent Burmese political history. Born as recently as 1914, he is exclusively a product of British education in Burma—an education which terminated abruptly with his expulsion from Rangoon University in 1936, following the prominent part he had played in the organization of the students' strike in that year. Thereafter, he occupied himself with political activities designed to bring about the end of British rule in Burma at an early date. This led to contacts with Nehru and other Indian Congress leaders after the outbreak of war (contacts which have been maintained and extended), and to contacts with the Japanese, who held out flattering prospects of independence to Burma, in return for the raising of a Burmese Independence Army. Following the Japanese conquest of Burma, Aung San became Defence Minister in the Japanese-sponsored Burmese Government. Disillusionment followed, however, on closer contact with Japanese imperialism, and under cover of his official position, he encouraged the Burmese resistance movement, and eventually he assumed the leadership of A-F.P.F.L.

When Japan surrendered in August 1945, Burma had already been freed from Japanese control by the efforts of British, Indian and Burmese troops, and the first discussions between the returning Governor, Sir Reginald Dorman-Smith and the leaders of the Burmese resistance movements had already taken place. Moreover, the British Government had issued a White Paper on Burma, pointing out that the goal of British policy was Dominion status, but

ving no period of time in which this advance was to be achieved. Not unturally, therefore, the leaders of the A-F.P.F.L. did not regard the White per as a sufficient response to their political aspirations. They consequently clined to serve on the Governor's Executive Council, and passed over into position. This was an extremely serious loss, since the condition of Burma as far from reassuring.

Between 1942 and 1945, Burma was the scene of two campaigns, and in dition, it suffered greatly from Japanese spoliation. In peacetime, Burma oduces about seven millions of tons of rice a year, of which about one-half exported, mainly to India. During the occupation, however, cultivation had eatly diminished, and there was nothing available for export. Moreover, ving to the almost complete absence of consumer goods, and their high price hen available, there was little inducement to extend cultivation to its pre-war :tent. Again, military operations had not only caused large-scale damage in e towns, but had broken down communications by road, and although the ritish forces did a great deal of valuable work in restoring communications, iis, of necessity, was chiefly along main routes. Further, there had been a idespread breakdown of law and order, and it was necessary to reorganize id strengthen the police-force, to suppress the innumerable bands of dacoits, or which internal instability had been responsible. The existence of dacoits ver wide areas was in itself a serious deterrent to the resumption of cultivation, specially in outlying districts.

So long as the political situation remained obscure, however, it was impossile to embark upon long-term measures of reconstruction, although the British Treasury put a loan of £87 million at the disposal of the Burmese Governnent for this purpose. Even the loan, however, became an object of suspicion o the Nationalists, who regarded the conditions attached to its expenditure as n instrument for preserving to Britain economic control of Burmese resources. Most serious of all, however, was the constitutional problem. For the period mmediately following the restoration of British rule, it was not proposed to reestablish the system of government existing before the invasion, since the impossibility of holding elections in the unsettled condition of the country was nanifest. An executive Council was therefore established, membership depending upon the selection of the Governor, after discussion with representative political groups. Since neither U Saw (leader of the Myochit party and now returned from Uganda) nor the A-F.P.F.L. would co-operate until Burma's constitutional status was clarified, and until defence and external affairs were placed in Burmese hands, the Council was composed almost exclusively of representatives of the older political parties, whose hold upon Burmese opinion was slight. So far had the situation deteriorated by the beginning of April 1946, that there were rumours of the arrest of U Aung San, whilst U Saw was contemplating withdrawing from the Executive Council the three members of his party who had accepted seats before his return, and finally, in Arakan, a

rebellion under U Seinda, a former Buddhist priest, was in progress. Nor was this all, for the Communist party, under Thakim Tan Tun, though small in numbers, was making headway and was seeking to deflect the movement for autonomy into a separatist revolution. More recently, there have been curious connections between the Communists (of which there are two distinct parties) and Dr. Ba Maw, leader of the Dobama party and Premier in the Burmese Government during the Japanese occupation.

By the autumn of 1946, therefore, it had become clear that the policy implied in the White Paper of 1945 had failed, and that a new approach was urgently required, associating the nationalist movement with the task of Burmese reconstruction. Sir Reginald Dorman-Smith was therefore replaced by Sir Hubert Rance who, as Chief Civil Affairs Officer of the Military Affairs Administration of Burma, had worked with the Burmese nationalists, and had won their confidence for his impartiality and understanding. Following his arrival, there was a marked improvement in the situation, for the A-F.P.F.L. agreed to enter the Executive Council, where they became the majority party, and General Aung San appropriately became Minister for Defence and Foreign Affairs. By these changes the League became the chief channel for the expression of Burmese views upon the future of the country, and the resolutions of a three-day conference at the beginning of November may be regarded as an expression of Burma's present political aspirations. They were:

1. That foreign exploitation of Burmese resources should be ended, and that foreign (that is British) corporations should be replaced by Burmese enterprises.
2. That Burmese diplomatic and consular representatives should be appointed, especially to Delhi, Nanking and Bangkok.
3. That the Government of Burma Act, 1935, should be amended so that only domiciled Burmese citizens should be given the franchise.
4. That all foreign troops should be withdrawn as soon as possible.
5. That the tribal areas at present under the jurisdiction of the Governor should be incorporated into Burma.

Significantly, at the same conference, the League expelled the Burmese Communists. Of the resolutions summarized above, the third represents the first step in a policy to exclude Indians from influence in Burmese affairs, and the fifth will be provocative of much discussion, since the inhabitants of the tribal areas are not believed to be in favour of such a proposal without safeguards. The A-F.P.F.L. now finds itself confronted with the completion of a federation of the older political parties in the Democratic National United Front. This federation owes its existence to the activities of Thakim Ba Sein, the energetic leader of the " Burma for the Burmans " Party, and Minister for Transport and Communications in the Executive Council. The D.N.U.F. includes two former Premiers, U Saw and Dr. Ba Maw, it stands for unqualified willingness to negotiate with the British Government for the amicable settlement of political and economic problems. The forthcoming elections will decide which of these two approaches commands the bulk of Burmese support.

Having regard to the developments in Burma since the defeat of Japan,

herefore, the announcement of the Prime Minister in the House of Commons n December 20, was no more than the logical next step, and although Mr. hurchill criticized " the appalling haste " of a policy to " scuttle ", the leading rticle of *The Times* of December 21 was much closer to political realities when : observed that " the Opposition would have been on stronger ground had they riticized the Government for procrastination rather than for impetuosity," or A-F.P.F.L. was understood to be prepared to withdraw from the Executive Council by the end of January, following which revolution would have been nevitable. After recalling the recent constitutional history of Burma, Mr. Attlee announced that a Burmese delegation would shortly be invited to London to discuss the country's future, and indicated that those discussions would probably go a good deal further than the White Paper of 1945. He added :

> We do not desire to retain within the Commonwealth and Empire any unwilling peoples. It is for the people of Burma to decide their own future, but we are certain that it will be to their interest, as it will to ours, if they decide to remain within the Commonwealth, and we sincerely hope they will arrive at such a decision. Likewise, we consider that the new constitution for Burma should be settled by the nationals of Burma and we believe that arrangements to this end can be made as a result of the forthcoming elections, without the necessity for holding fresh elections for a Constituent Assembly, on the analogy of what has already been done in India, where the Constituent Assembly is based upon the ordinary provincial elections. In the same way, His Majesty's Government are of opinion that the Burmese Government, which has now been formed, should within the existing constitution exercise a full measure of authority in Burma. It is not possible, of course, as was pointed out in the case of India, to enact a new interim Constitution, and the old Constitution must therefore be carried on in form, but His Majesty's Government have no desire to interfere with the day-to-day administration, which is now in the hands of Burmese members of the Governor's Executive, and we shall endeavour in the forthcoming discussions to remove any difficulties that the delegation may feel still to exist in this regard.

The bulk of the Burmese delegation left Rangoon by air on January 7, but by that date Aung San had already left for India, where he held discussions with the Congress leaders, and in a highly-interesting broadcast, he advocated a close union of the peoples of Asia to combat " imperial bondage ", adding " we have nothing to do with imperial preferences or currency blocs." He also pointed out that Asiatic countries must help the Viet Nam Republic, which was struggling for survival against French imperialism.

In his speech of welcome to the delegation on January 13, Mr. Attlee reiterated his earlier statement that the Burmese were entirely free to settle their own future, and to decide whether they would remain within the Commonwealth or not, and *The Times,* in a leading article the following morning, expressed the view that A-F.P.F.L. represented the majority of the Burmese people, and emphasized the desire of its leaders to reach an agreed solution of the problem of Burma's future in association with the British Government. Aung San's reply to Mr. Attlee, whilst friendly in tone, carefully and no doubt unavoidably omitted any hint of the ultimate relations of Burma with this country.

Discussions proceeded smoothly and rapidly, and the Government was able to communicate the text of an agreement to Parliament on January 28—significantly, three days before the time-limit which had been set in Burma. It provides for a Constituent Assembly to be convened as soon as possible, so that for all practical purposes, the Legislature contemplated by the Act of 1935 is already dead. Elections will occur in April, and only Burma nationals will be entitled to vote. A Burma national is defined for purposes of the franchise and for eligibility to stand as a candidate as " a British subject or the subject of an Indian state who was born in Burma and resided there for a total period of not less than eight years in the ten years immediately preceding either January 1, 1942, or January 1, 1947." This provision, it will be seen, excludes recent immigrants. In the transitional period, the Legislative Council will be increased from fifty to one hundred members, and nominations will be made by the Governor on the basis of the elections to the Constituent Assembly, with the addition of the small number of persons to represent immigrant minorities. Moreover, in the interim period, the Government of Burma will be regarded, as far as possible, as on the footing of a Dominion Government. Burma will enjoy financial autonomy, and Defence and External Affairs will be under the control of the Council.

Immediate steps are to be taken to give Burma international status. Burma will appoint diplomatic representatives abroad, and a High Commissioner in London, and Great Britain will sponsor Burma's application for membership of the United Nations, and of any other international bodies which Burma may wish to enter. As far as defence is concerned, whilst British forces in Burma remain under British control, all Burmese forces " forthwith " come under Burmese control, and Great Britain will give Burma all assistance in building up the Defence forces in Burma.

One very important feature of the agreement is the decision that the Frontier Areas will be entirely free to choose the method by which they will be associated with the Burmese State, and a conference of representatives of the Frontier Areas is being convened to discuss this question. In the meanwhile, there will be free intercourse between the Frontier Areas and the rest of Burma—a development which will no doubt bring a rapid extension of A-F.P.F.L. influence in these areas.

There are important financial provisions annexed to the agreement. Burma has already received an interest-free loan of £8,000,000 for the year October 1945-September 1946, and a loan of £7,500,000 in similar terms has already been granted for the year October 1946-September 1947. These or some part of them may be converted into gifts if Burma's financial position requires it, and there may be further grants towards Burma's budgetary deficit.

The main feature of what Mr. Churchill described as " this dismal transaction " are by no means surprising to those who have followed the development of affairs in Burma since liberation, and although the haste to conclude an

greement in time to permit the Burmese delegation to return by the end of anuary is plainly apparent, reflection shows that Great Britain had a simple noice between clear alternatives—either to negotiate the agreement which has een reached, or else to prepare for a large-scale campaign in Burma. What nat would have implied may be discovered from the present position of France n Indo-China. Even had a campaign been successful, the problem of estab- shing a workable form of government would have remained for solution at ne end of the fighting, in an embittered atmosphere. Further, refusal to egotiate now would probably have thrown A-F.P.F.L. into opposition, and vould certainly have weakened its position, in favour of extreme and less esponsible organizations. Finally, the break-down of negotiations with Burma would have prejudiced the chances of securing a workable compromise n India.

It is not necessary, therefore, to praise A-F.P.F.L. and its leaders with the nthusiasm that has characterized some press comment, in order to agree that great wisdom has been shown in this agreement, which will unquestionably ncur hostile criticism in Burma. Nor, in view of some of Aung San's recent atterances, would it be wise to assume that Burma will be content with anything ess than full independence. One of the most striking features of Far Eastern politics to-day is the similarity in outlook and structure of the various National- st movements. Revolutionary as these movements may appear, in contrast with the parties which existed before 1939, those more responsible movements are in turn under fire from Communist and other organizations which have sprung up behind them. No one wishes to see the Chinese tragedy resurrected on a smaller scale in Burma or elsewhere. It can be prevented if the new Nationalism is met upon a footing of equality and with liberal proposals. Even if this latest move should show that "virtue is its own reward" and that no other reward, in gratitude or otherwise, is forthcoming, that can at least provide an object-lesson in a world in which morality in international affairs is not unduly conspicuous.

One last point must be made, in respect of the financial clauses. It is possible to argue that this country is in no position to make gifts or interest-free loans. Such an argument, however, misses the point that a large part of Burma's present difficulties is due to the chaos of the war years. Even if Burma had been independent in 1939, it is not improbable that to-day we should have been listening to her pleas for assistance. As a British possession, her case is so much the stronger.

THE NEW GERMAN TRADE UNIONS

By Melton S. Davis

SINCE it is generally accepted that any revival of democracy in Germany will have to come from the working people, their efforts are being critically watched by labour elements in other countries over the world. Against a background of looting, hunger, disease and fear these people are attempting to solve the problems of their land, a land that all too often seems completely unrepentant.

There are very few experienced leaders of labour in Germany to-day. The young people distrust the old who failed to stop Hitler. The older people distrust the young as still full of Nazi-taught doctrines. The Allied occupation authorities look at both warily.

This is all part of the legacy Hitler left. Union officials and labour politicians were high on his list of groups to be " taken care of ". To start with he used an interesting technique. A well known union official would be placed in gaol for four or five months. Then, with no more reason than that given for his arrest he would be allowed out. If, during the time he was out, he made the slightest move to contact any of his old co-workers, if he engaged in any political activities, if he made statements that were not always definitely pro-Nazi, back into prison he would go. Then the process would be repeated a second time. The third time he stayed in.

Hitler also had a technique to keep union members in line. Workers were given jolly parties, plenty of pigs' feet and sauerkraut and beer. They were loaned money to build houses. They could go to the opera for 50 pfennigs. They could join attractive organizations like *Kraft durch Freude* (Strength through Joy), which provided organized trips to Norway or the Canary Islands. Travellers were chosen by the owners of the factories. This called for some extra apple-polishing by employees. The cost was small, about $1.50 a month for the average worker. Paternalism is cheap, if you only worry about the financial cost.

Everybody belonged to the *Deutsche Arbeits Front*. There were no jurisdictional arguments. There was collective bargaining, nicely prearranged by the industrialists and Nazi party officials. The D.A.F. had all the independence of a brightly painted marionette. It jiggled when the employer said " Jiggle! " and it bowed when the late and unlamented Robert Ley pulled the necessary strings. The average German worker was fed a continuous flow of carefully selected propaganda, cleverly calculated to keep him satisfied, silent and sweating for Hitler's war machine. The Gestapo had special instructions

to take steps—strong steps like concentration camps and executions—to prevent any semblance of democracy in the German Workers' Front.

In virtually every European country, labouring men formed the basis for resistance movements. Germany was no exception. Despite accusations to the contrary, members of organized labour in Germany provided a very substantial underground.

But these organizations had the highest death rate in the world. One Berlin *sub rosa* anti-fascist group had around 600 members in 1936. By 1942, 400 members had been executed. That was the year their leader was caught and beheaded. They had been putting up posters, printing pamphlets and hurriedly chalking anti-Nazi phrases on pavements, in public rest rooms, on train windows. A group of Communist brickmakers once burnt into bricks which were sent all over Germany: *Rot Front lebt noch-Annawerk Oeslau* (The Red Front still lives). There is no such place as Oeslau in Germany! In the plot of July 20, 1944, there were many labour men. They took a leading part in this attempt to kill Hitler and overthrow the Nazis.

To-day they are starting out anew through revitalized and joint trade union organizations. There are over 830,000 members in more than 500 trade unions in the American occupied zone. This means that about thirty per cent. of the labour force there is now organized. The British more industrial zone, has in excess of 1,200,000 members in 170 unions. British Military Government is looking forward to even fewer but larger unions. Including the Russian zone, memberships come to about 5,760,000. That is about half of the trade unions' pre-war strength. Berlin, under joint Allied control, has 411,000 organized in unions, against a former 600,000.

Only those employed are allowed to be members at the present time, since there are so many people not working that the main trade represented would be that of the unemployed. There are 800,000 without jobs in Berlin alone.

Uniform social insurance is tending to be set up on the contributions of ten per cent. of the earnings of workers and an additional ten per cent. by employers. This will cover payment for unemployment, illness, accidents, old age and funeral expenses. Dues are about one hour's wages per week and are collected by shop stewards.

Works councils once again have been re-established. A new law allows employees to elect a *Betriebsrat* to represent their interests (trade, social and economic) in dealing with the employers. These councils negotiate on the operation of collective agreements, submit ideas for improving production, co-operate in preventing war production, aid in the de-nazification programme, and help in the creation and management of social works. This is a pretty full programme, but for men who have not known opportunities of this sort for twelve years they do pretty well. Works councils are beginning to take the place of shop stewards.

Labour courts have been set up throughout the American and British zones.

This is one of the mediums used for arbitration of labour disputes. In co-operation with trade unions, the works councils negotiate on the application of collective agreements. Then, minor disputes in connection with these agreements go before the labour courts which are similar to impartial referees used in America and England. Other cases are taken up by arbitration committees composed of panels suggested by trade unions and employers. Each group has equal representation. The chairman of this committee is appointed by the labour department of the State government. Arbitration proceedings follow much along the lines of those used by the American Arbitration Association for labour management disputes. Arbitration is not compulsory unless it involves military security.

In the Russian zone, arbitration courts have been abolished to be replaced by a Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The membership consists of one-third representatives of management, one-third union delegates and one-third State officials who are experts on labour and production questions. All contracts are passed on by this board. Once they are accepted, the State police enforces them. Under the Weimar Republic, the arbitration courts tended to side with management. This is presumed to be the reason for their abolition. An example of labour organization in the Russian zone is Union 17, comprising musical soloists and stage artists, film and radio workers, vaudeville and circus performers, orchestral musicians, theatre technicians, authors and composers, painters, architects and journalists. The admission of medical men, scholars and scientists is envisaged in the future. The locals of Union 17 are attached, when possible, to producing units; each theatre, newspaper, radio station, etc., being a separate grouping. Membership is open to all workers without professional examination. It is also with minor exceptions obligatory, on the principle of " open unions and closed shops."

Virtually all unions in the American and British zones are organized along industrial lines. This includes clerical employees and supervisory personnel as well as manual workers. There are few unions solely for white-collar workers.

The review of German Labour laws enacted since 1932 has been started. Most of them have been inoperative under the occupation. The whole of the infamous Nazi " Labour Code " enacted in 1934 will be discarded. Military Government authorities are beginning to release some of the properties formerly owned by the trade unions. Frankfurt, for instance, had a workers' bank, one of the largest in the city. Other unions owned newspapers, life insurance companies, housing companies, office buildings and theatres.

Plans are being made to re-open the Academy of Labour, the workers' college in Frankfurt. Classes in philosophy, psychology, history, and natural science will supplement the courses in trade trends, employment problems, and finance to be given to the fifty men originally enrolled. Expenses will be paid by the various labour organizations sending them to the school.

Bavarian trade unions have established a training school near Garmisch-Partenkirchen for young trade union members. In Stuttgart, last October, the W.B.G.B. (Wuerttemberg-Baden Trade Unions) sponsored "Youth Trade Union" held its first assembly. The 300 delegates between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one, represented 15,000 young people. The union, or *Gewerkschaftshygend,* is a social, recreational and cultural organization composed of apprentices and young factory workers.

Before 1933, all labour organizations were also federations but to-day the picture is spotty. In Berlin and Bavaria unions are highly centralized. In Greater Hesse, individual unions are autonomous. In North Wuerttemberg, the W.G.B., which is the *Wuerttembergische Gewerkschafts Bund,* gives assurance to local unions by helping with organization, recruitment, and denazification. But they retain some measure of autonomy. The dominant union, in fact, the only union in Berlin, is the F.D.G.B., *Freier Deutscher Gewerkschafts Bund* (Federation of Free German Trade Unions).

In Frankfurt, the dominant union has the same name, F.D.G.B., as the Berlin group but it is not a part of it. Within the structure of the Frankfurt F.D.G.B. are autonomous unions who negotiate their own contracts, control their own treasuries, set up separate educational programmes, and conduct their own vocational training. The F.D.G.B. is used more or less as a clearing house for various representatives to exchange information, confer on common problems and plan co-operative action.

The W.B.G.B. (Wuerttemberg-Baden Trade Unions) have formed into a federation similar to the Frankfurt group with possibly even more independence for the individual unions. They publish a weekly in Stuttgart. Frankfurt unions also get out a weekly. The Bavarian trade unions are now publishing a twice monthly paper calculated to reach 100,000 circulation. In Berlin, the F.D.G.B. publishes a daily.

Local trade unions are being amalgamated in each zone so that if there is ever a united German nation, they can fit themselves into national federations. Those unions that tend towards centralization say it is a form of organization which is necessary during this traditional period when the main problem is getting members and forming them into working units. This overall problem is felt to be more important than the specific objectives of any particular union. To-day wages and working conditions are frozen so that collective bargaining does not mean much.

There have been several work-stoppages in the American zone which were settled before they became serious strikes. The only strikes have been "prestige strikes", resentment against being searched, against loss of rights, and "political strikes", against verdicts on Schacht, von Papen, and Fritsche.

In the British zone, strikes have taken the form of protests against the cutting down of rations, and the eviction of Germans to provide housing for English families. There has been no word of strikes in the Russian zone,

though the right to strike is admitted. Wages and prices are frozen there.

On May 2, 1933, when Hitler made out his own union card, the trade unions were being torn by continuous political fights. There were three major labour organizations, two of them strongly political, while the Christian Trade Unions were tied in with a particular religious group. They had no joint programme for crisis periods. Socialists, Communists, Catholics were continually fighting each other within the various trade union confederations. This left them wide open for Hitler. To-day all three of these have agreed that it was this very division which enabled the Nazis to walk in over the ideals of working men. One of the present union leaders, Willi Richter, recently said that " it was difficult to face union leaders in other parts of the world because German unions had not stopped Hitler's rise."

However, the same old lines seem to be forming again despite the efforts of Allied occupation authorities. For instance in Berlin, trade union elections are supposedly not held on the basis of political affiliation. But the next day after the voting, results are listed in all newspapers giving so many positions to this political party and so many to that.

The non-political affiliation ruling for Berlin trade unions was originated in a manoeuvre by which Communists and left-wing Social Democrats outwitted those Independent Social Democrats who refused to merge into a working-class party with the Communists. The ruling was effected in February when only a few people knew of the plans for a combined S.P.D. (Social Democrats) and K.P.D. (Communists). Thirteen S.P.D. men were elected to the Executive Board of the Berlin F.D.G.B.; fourteen K.P.D. and three C.D.U. (Christian Democratic) candidates. When the merger went through, in April, S.E.D. (Social Unity Party of former S.P.D. and K.P.D.) claimed twenty-four members of the Executive Board since ten of the S.P.D. men lived in sectors of Berlin where the merger was successful. The remaining three, Dr. Suhr, present Secretary of the Independent S.P.D., Nikolaus Bernard and Herr Hoeger lived in other Allied occupation sectors which had set up independent S.P.D. groups. Now that S.P.D. has won the Berlin municipal elections they will press their claims for fairer representation on the F.D.G.B. Executive Board.

The Social Democrats had been winning shop steward elections for some time before the municipal voting, even in the Russian sector. They swept into victory, on October 15, carrying *bourgeois* districts as well as working class sections. On March 12, 1932 (Berlin's last free election) S.P.D. won only twenty-two per cent. of all votes. The Communists had twenty per cent. and the Nazis thirty-eight per cent.

This Berlin election can provide a crystal ball for events in the rest of the country once Germany is unified. At that time, S.P.D. is likely to be the strongest political party in the country, the Christian parties, numerically stronger, being ideologically split already. Its party programme is built up on " the basic theories of Marx and Engels; socialization of the means of pro-

luction and planned economy." Their appeal is alert, lively, especially so for . defeated, occupied country. They have a strong, dynamic leader, one-armed Kurt Schumacher.

As far as the Social Unity Party is concerned, once S.P.D. is allowed in the Russian zone, S.E.D. will have to become the Communist party and again ight for the workers' votes. In November 1932, Germany's last free election, it was fairly close, the Social Democrats having 7,237,000 votes and the Communists 5,974,000. Only a miracle can bring the Communists up to near the same parity again. Until that time, S.P.D. will claim to speak politically for German labour.

Trade union aims are broad in Germany. They include, as the Munich shop stewards have unanimously declared, " opposition to the reinstitution of a private, capitalistic economy and support of reformation along democratic and socialistic lines." The Frankfurt unions have come out for " re-shaping the individualistic-capitalistic system into a socialist one." There is hardly a trade union in Germany that has not expressed the desire for equal representation in economic and social institutions and asked for a voice in management. It is no longer a question how far the Allied occupation authorities will be willing to go along with them. In the Russian zone it is reported that factories are being capably managed by trade unionists. Working-class parties in the Governments of Britain and France will undoubtedly see that their fellow working men are given aid in preventing another war and building a true democracy.

In the American zone, the constitution of all three States contain provisions for socialization of basic industries. In Hesse, the largest *Land,* the constitution states that mines (coal, potash and ores), iron and steelworks, power plants and rail transport will become community property. Large banks and insurance firms also will be placed under State administration. The constitution also establishes the eight hour working day, specifies a paid twelve day vacation each year for every worker, safeguards the right to strike, but prohibits lockouts and forbids child labour.

Moreover, virtually every trade union in Germany has been strong in its call for a thorough de-nazification of business and industry. They all ask for uniform social insurance and healthful housing facilities. They have not hesitated to take a strong stand for the raising of the economic standards of living and the elevation of the intellectual and cultural level of all Germans. Along with this, they feel, will come better international understanding based on the well-being and the political awareness of workers all over the world.

(The author is a journalist who has recently served as an officer in the American Military Government of Germany.)

A VISIONARY IN THE BEE-GARDEN

By S. L. Bensusan

THE countryman old enough to have known veterans who kept bees safe from harsh winds in skeps under a garden wall, may feel that some of his happiest hours were spent in their company. If he does I claim kinship; *et ego in Arcadia.*

Turning back the pages of the years to reach those that deal with first bee-keeping experiences, I salute the gentle, lovable old bee-masters who "have drunk their cup a round or two before." They taught me all they knew about bees, and in the most attractive surroundings; no man could have had better or more patient masters. From earliest days the hive had been a mystery, perhaps it is to all boys, and the men who made me free of the hive meant as much in their way as Hans Andersen and the Brothers Grimm; they too gave me admission to fairyland.

From bee-watching to bee-keeping the transition was brief, I started an apiary with an outlay of five pounds at a time when the best price to be had for complete sections delivered to a great London store forty miles away was seven shillings and sixpence a dozen. If the buyer could find fault, however trifling, with any section he would demand two at the price of one, being a sound, alert man with no spiced conscience, who recognized young enthusiasts when he met them. The apiary grew, and with it the wonder and the delight of a service that involved punishment as well as reward. Gradually, noting the colour of the pollen brought home, I learned to know where the bees had been foraging; subtle shade and flavour told whence nectar had been drawn; it became possible to differentiate between honey from apple, clover and lime, while the sounds within the hive could tell of content, unrest or the imminence of swarming. Each hive was a distinct world, there were good and bad ones, angry stocks and placid.

At a time when I reckoned no fine day between May and September well spent unless it included an hour or two among the hives, a memorable experience rewarded me. Many years have passed, but the occasion still stands out defined clearly as the graver's line on a copperplate. It was a late May morning, such a ripe spring day as fills its lovers with a sudden sense of life made perfect. My apiary was in an orchard overlooking the Chelmer valley; sainfoin and white clover were grown nearby.

At mid-day a hive released the expected swarm; it flew right into the eye of the sun, effecting a marvellous metamorphosis. The light took all density from the body of the bees and turned them into glittering opals; yes, it was

othing less than opalescence in the morning blaze, indeed it was something ıore, a sudden revelation of the relationship of bees to the sun itself. In half minute or less the glittering pageant had passed, the jewels had become bees nce more, the swarm circled round a pear tree, the dizzy flight found its centre ı a rapidly growing cluster, and soon the precious gift of May was housed in skep to await transfer in late afternoon.

Many other swarms followed, some travelled far and were lost, none renewed he splendour of the flight recorded, but with the memory of it registered among he most beautiful sights granted to me, I set to work to find out something more bout bees than Columella, Virgil, Maeterlinck, Tickner Edwardes, and a dozen thers had offered. I was not concerned for more honey nor larger apiary; we were already able to supply all home needs and to give freely to friends. For many years I sent my tributes far and near, as far as Max Gate, near Dorchester, o Thomas and Florence Hardy. No, the knowledge desired was of the place f the honey-bee in nature's scheme, her relation to the sunlight which for one cstatic moment had seemed so intimate. I sought to know the fashion of her working, the secret of her marvellous hexagonal cell, the mystery of partheno-genesis that enables the virgin forager to lay eggs that produce the perfect drone, the conditions in which a queen-bee can be produced from a worker egg nd why the hatching-out period is briefest for the queen, longer for the worker, ongest for the drone. I sought to recover the lore of the old-time bee-garden till valuable although the skep had outstanding faults and led to the destruc-ion of the best stocks. Explanations from rural veterans were of value even hough they might not be of the kind acceptable to those who, as Oscar Wilde said of the cynic, understand the price of everything and the value of nothing.

Search was long and seemed hopeless, there were plenty of old facts en-shrined in new and attractive form, but nothing fresh. Then one day a friend ent me Rudolf Steiner's lectures on bees, given to the builders of the Goethea-ıum at Stuttgart, and the long quest came to the end. Light shone on the apiary for the first time; I felt the truth that Richard Jefferies uttered: "the ıours when the mind is absorbed by beauty are the only hours when we really ive." For me those lectures brought back that unforgotten hour in May when he swarm flew into the sun, it answered questions that one may hesitate to ask n a world where all progress is estimated on a cash basis.

I have always been conscious of certain unrecognized relationships between ıs and the world. I remembered what W. H. Hudson wrote: "The blue sky, he brown soil beneath, the grass and trees, the animals, the wind and rain and sun and stars are never strange to me, for I am in and am one of them; and my flesh and the soil are one, and the heat in my blood and in the sunshine are one." Who, being a country-lover, has not shared this belief in some measure? Who in times of stress has failed to be consoled by it?

Small wonder if Rudolf Steiner's teaching found immediate response; it

seemed so right that all life should be seen as a unity, differing only in manifestation. How could anyone doubt the affinity of bees with the sunshine, after seeing them change into glittering jewels at the sun's behest? I felt that I had been the permitted witness of a revelation, so quiet was the countryside, so remote my apiary that anything seemed possible just then.

The neighbourhood still held many bee-keepers who kept their stocks in old-fashioned straw skeps and handled them without veils or gloves. When they died, their widow or child hung a strip of black cloth on each hive, and gave the bees solemn assurance that the new owner would look after them. Whittier recorded this custom in a charming poem called "Telling the Bees." Then, these quaintly credulous folk told me, the bees would not desert the hive as they would have done, lacking such assurance.

The veteran bee-masters never suffered from rheumatism, one and all claimed that honey kept them well. Was it their faith that made them whole? Whence came it, this collection of strange beliefs held as firmly as though they were based upon a prehistoric creed? Probably they had been passed down from father to son from a time beyond which "the memory of man runneth not to the contrary."

When Rudolf Steiner spoke of bees he talked as though he belonged to the hive; he praised the qualities that are their special endowment, even while stating that they cannot draw upon the universal wisdom because they do not possess a brain. They are acted upon by forces and bring what he termed the love-life of flowers into the hive, because they gather their food from what may be called the flowers' love centres. Hence the rare quality of honey that no other food in the world possesses; Dr. Steiner said it can stimulate the soul forces in man. All people, he declared, should eat honey, particularly when they grow old.

He noted curious facts. The eggs that the queen-bee lays in worker cells take just as long to hatch as the sun takes to turn on its axis, so that, as Rudolf Steiner saw them, they are hardly affected by the earth in pre-natal development, while the drone needs a longer time to hatch out and consequently does not enjoy the same solar association. The queen, needing less time than the worker to hatch out, is even more closely associated with solar forces, and flies to the light to be fecundated, while the drone that mates with her at the cost of life is the one that can fly farthest from the earth and is consequently most removed from its associations. His life must be the price of his intercourse with the queen in the empty, sunlit spaces, but out of the single brief association the queen derives the power to lay eggs at the rate of more than 2,000 a day in full season.

Dr. Steiner told us that the bee is blind and is drawn to the nectaries of flowers through the medium of a sense between taste and smell; he added that just before a new queen is born in the hive she has a certain luminosity visible through the cell, and that this enables the foragers to see for the first time, but only for a little while. It is necessary to remember that Rudolf Steiner was

airvoyant; he enjoyed what is sometimes called an extension of faculty.

It is easy to reject his teaching as fanciful, unreal, even unreliable, the fact mains that the picture he paints is in itself convincing and has a most stimuting effect upon the bee-keeper's imagination. For those who have not udied his philosophy it may be hard to grasp his theory of correspondences, : to understand readily what he means when he says that there is a definite lation between man, the hive and the bees. Yet when you have read his ooks it is easy indeed to believe, and when you handle hives in the light of the einer explanations an extraordinarily intimate association is set up.

The bees' reaction to colour is not like ours, owing to the absence of sight. n front of a red hive they experience a sense of warmth; in front of a blue one ie sense of cold; when light is admitted to the hive the bees only feel the iemical effect of it. The consciousness of things unseen is not peculiar to bees. leeping cats have it, they visualize things by aid of their sense of smell.

Dr. Steiner taught that in olden days beeswax was sacred and that the descripon of Canaan as a land overflowing with milk and honey was early recognition f the foods that contributed most to the healthy life of mankind. For some eason unexplained an angry or nervous man incites bees to attack him. Dr. teiner pointed out that there are emanations from humans that affect the less eveloped forms of life; these apparently influence bees in their reactions. 'or example, certain of these outflowings are so pleasing to plants that he who as them obtains what is sometimes called the green finger or the growing hand —a gift all gardeners know.

By close study of the hive we learn much lying beyond its narrow boundaries; we must begin by regarding the bee colony as a totality, study the communal eeling and look askance at queens brought from a distance. Many bee-keepers iave learned to their cost that bees do not always thrive on syrup or candy, but f thyme, camomile and a small seasoning of salt be added, they will take to it eadily. Above all they must not be over-stimulated, and on this account Steiner rejected the much-praised American clover on which many apiarists ely. Do nothing, he said, to urge your hives to suffer strain. This is a nodern tendency, greatly developed in America, and as bad for the hive as excessive milk yield is bad for the dairy herd. What you have done to your lomestic animal you may still do to the hive if you subordinate the interests of he bees to the production of honey. Steiner insisted on this.

Even the orchard will not attract alone, in blossoming time there should be flowers in plenty of the kind bees like best. He did not name them but they are well known to bee masters. For the English gardens you want alyssum, aubrietia and arabis, with borage and cornflower, canterbury bells and majoram, mignonette, nemophila, wallflowers and thyme, to say nothing of other flowering herbs.

In all probability, Dr. Steiner said, the aphis which may be recognized as living blossom is the finest honey in the world. Man does not appreciate this,

but the ants do. They capture the aphides and take them to their nests to house in what corresponds to our cow-sheds, milk them by stroking them with their antennae and so rescue the sweetness and freshness of blossoms.

Bees, ants and wasps communicate formic acid to the plants they feed on, and formic acid maintains flower-life. In days of old Dr. Steiner told us, peasants would never destroy ant-heaps. Their knowledge, traditional or instinctive, had taught them that the formic acid in ant-heaps enables woodlands to resist decay. Wasps, bees and ants, help nature to live and thrive, and formic acid is an essential part of the human body; it is produced from oxalic acid and can be taken into the human system through a decoction of wood sorrel or common red clover. When formic acid leaves the body, said Dr. Steiner, the body dies. All nature's processes, he insisted, are intelligent, and man's errors are due to his failure to consider nature's harmony, his readiness to believe that business interests are the matter of supreme importance. There is nothing superfluous in nature's design, everything has a part to play, but if we try to improve upon her methods we do so at our peril. Few can find any worth in wasps, but Dr. Steiner said that apart from their place as formic acid carriers, they must be recognized as the progenitors of bees.

Writing of the value of formic acid, he said that in districts where there are no ant-heaps, telegraphy is not easy, because it demands the presence of formic acid, and outside the towns the acid can only be produced naturally by ant-heaps. As so many of Dr. Steiner's more surprising statements were challenged, it would be of interest to inquire into the official view of this one, though it goes without saying that the executive official is not expected to be in touch with a subject so recondite. Steiner once declared quite bluntly that those who begin to study their science only at the point of what exists to-day give themselves up to illusion. "Many people will tell you that what I say is ridiculous," he remarked, "but I can remember when they denounced as ridiculous the proposal to build mountain railways." It was an apt illustration—no leader carried his followers to less familiar heights.

He accepted the value of the old bee-keepers' unpleasant remedy for rheumatism—a regular course of stings—and remarked that it would be effective if the patient's heart were strong.

He insisted that intelligence is not the special attribute of man, it pervades nature. When we are looking for purpose behind the eternal procession and march of life, it is our fault if we fail to find it. Should we think that we are qualified to teach nature her business and to show her short cuts, we are behaving foolishly. Nature knows, and we are either ignorant or merely groping after knowledge. If we offend man-made laws we are called upon to pay a penalty; we know what it is, there are statutes to tell us. If we offend against nature we also pay penalty, but the extent is unknown, for we cannot read nature's penal code, we can only experience its force.

He saw the earth as he saw the bee-hive, a living entity in whose work man-

:ind has an allotted part to play, that is to maintain the eternal harmony, to ›bey nature's laws. Steiner created a farming system, he taught a sane agricul- ure in which the earth is not exploited, in which the soil, fed on the organic ubstances it produces, maintains the rhythm of life. He warned us of the grow- ng loss of fertility, the grave danger that, by misuse of the soil, men might ›erish in the midst of plenty. When he spoke about insects, fruit and flowers, ıe spoke as a practised and competent agriculturist whose knowledge was ac- quired on the land. He insisted upon response to nature's method of restoring ;oil fertility and warned men against the modern methods. " Plants under the nfluence of mineral manures do not enjoy a full life and after a time lose their ıutritive value." Here is the kind of warning that sets thoughtful men pon- ›ering the errors of what we call progress.

From Virgil by way of a hundred writers, naturalists and philosophers down to Rendl men have written about the hive, it was left to Rudolf Steiner to put the story upon a plane not approached before. It was his to show the part that the bee together with the wasp and ant play in the world we tend so woefully to misuse, how their gifts though not comparable with ours, enable them to play definite parts in the Divine economy, how we can learn from them and how out of the poison, the formic acid associated with each, come healing and maintenance. It is like a romance or a voyage into a realm never before ex- plored; we see suddenly a picture of world order, we grasp significance of acts not hitherto understood, though quite familiar. Dr. Steiner enforced a greater confidence in the working of the unseen forces that rule and regulate our being, and showed how the hive may be studied to afford a deeper intimacy with life itself. The most attractive writers have done no more than touch the outside of the hive, its depths were left for exploration to one who could travel farther than them all; we may perhaps be reminded of the triumph of Aaron over the magicians at the court of the Egyptian king.

Most of us take honey in our stride, so to speak; it may be as much to us as really good home-made jam and nothing more, but after reading the Steiner lectures, honey assumes what is perhaps pride of place on the list of foods that sustain mankind. It brings us, the earthbound, into touch with the sun, and we have the assurance that for the very old among us as well as the young it has a special value. Even those who cannot digest it readily can cure their disability by recourse to certain herbs that he indicated. Then, too, while many of us regard the hive as totalitarian, he raised its status and made the community appear more fascinating than ever before. Moreover, in associating the life and work of the bee with that of the wasps and ants, he added new interest to the study. Others have done the same, and at length, but no other man ever approached them from this angle or with equal vision. Yet these addresses were given to simple workmen engaged on the first Goetheanum.

That shrine of so many of Rudolf Steiner's hopes has long been burnt down, the teacher has passed, but his teaching endures.

OVER THE DALES

By Patric Dickinson

OVER the dales spaced in an azure sky
They dignify, move steadily and with care
Snow-coloured clouds as round and whorled as snails
Whose silver trails below the rivers are.

Their shadows brood like ghosts that haunt a scene
Where they have been in violence stricken down,
As if these bastions forcing the first flood
Upon them trod and crushed them into stone.

In this colossal play we move; and in the pools
The Caddis curls itself inside its leaf,
The Butterwort traps its fly, and the Dipper's day
Is some way seaward—all Time is alive.

(Clapped in a clock sullen it will not sing
For Man, but cringes at the bars of its cage:
The miner breaks his heart upon the rock,
The cities stock the shops with Youth for Age

To buy back if it can:) and now the clouds
Gather in crowds into a terrible one
Lump bigger than London—O people it with Man
From all life drawn up by the sucking sun:—

A dead wind blows it boiling blue as lead,
The birds and beasts are afraid, earth nerves itself:
Man bursts in thunder down—and the flowers grow,
The river flows brimming its rocky shelf,

And across the skies miraculously clean
Still and serene the clouds like snow-white snails
Put out their horns again and with slow grace
Resume their pace over the joyful dales.

A WINDOW ON LONDON

By Pamela Hinkson

MY third floor windows look into the trees of the square and I see the world below through their branches. It is an old-fashioned square, surrounded by tall houses, my side built back straight up from the grass, front facing the street, the other three facing the square with the road between. The "Garden" is a long green sward planted with fine ash and plane trees. With the railings gone for war purposes, this became indeed a London Common, giving all the impression of a village green. The varying seasons hold each their changing beauty. In autumn the sward is a gold, russet and green carpet, beneath gold leafed canopies held on brown and gilded poles as the falling leaves reveal the tree trunks—the planes then shedding their bark; in winter, under snow, the square is almost loveliest, seeming lengthened and widened in its beautiful white austerity, criss-crossed by black branches, night-blue shadowed under them, dogs' paws or human feet moving with a crisp joyous sound, suggesting especially thrilling adventure when heard at night or in the first morning; by day the pink and yellow houses opposite might be those of a pre-war South German city. Their windows reflect the eastern sunrise and so send it to me facing north-west. In spring the green-tipped trees give an illusion of delicate, pale green, falling snow. Through such a lovely veil, white and yellow porches take on glamour of infinitely romantic possibilities within. The whole is insistent in its resemblance to a lovely ballet decor, accentuated in the autumn picture when gold leaves fall gently, tenderly, through the still air. Full summer, with its too heavy leaf, reducing the size of my wide-windowed room which is the centre box for this theatre, is the least lovely moment. But from the west, between the trees and the houses, the sunset comes into my room.

We are rich in birds. Owls call at night, pigeons coo in summer, court in the trees in spring. Blackbirds and thrushes shout their clear sweetness from the high branches. A blackbird coming to my sill for his breakfast saved me need of an alarm for many weeks, and how could I complain if on occasion such a morning song wakened me an hour too soon? Once at night a certain faint frightened twitter of the owls was a sure raid warning; by day pigeons and sparrows made a flight as before a storm when the explosion came.

We are not, thank Heaven, grand as are other squares, with wooden palings, gates and warning notices that dogs must be led. Once as I passed one of

those garden squares, I saw a little boy outside a gate and a little girl within, playing Pyramus and Thisbe movingly. "Can't Peter come in and play?" asked the little girl. "We don't live in the square," Peter's mother replied sadly.

But we have not set beautiful flower beds to be protected—only the strong trees, branches high overhead, a few lilacs and laburnums flowering in spring and the grass that grows green despite many passing feet. Those passers have told chapters of life and history. Once there were no children in the square, as in London. One has either seen a city without children, knowing the cause of that, or one has not seen it. One has seen and felt the children's return—or one has not had that experience.

There was young life then—a Victoria League Junior Officers' Club, a few doors from mine. The uniformed young figures—R.A.F. predominating—from the Dominions and Colonies, dark-skinned some of them, sat or lay out on the grass in summer, passed beneath my window, walking as in country fields. The Club's open windows showed games being played within, heads bent in friendship and talk, round dining tables. The grey street in front of the houses was lit by blue-clad groups wearing wings and decorations, as they came and went.

Then the war ended and the Club closed and all that vital young life scattered over the wide world, leaving a blank behind. There came instead presently a girls' finishing school, lovely youth again, to become part of our square life, walking and reading and sewing under the trees, girls' heads bent in the windows where there had been boys' heads. At evening there was a fencing class on the square grass. A circle of little boys (the children had come back) absorbed spectators. Later there was much amateur fencing, done with fallen sticks perilously, yet showing that the watching eye had learnt much. And "my Mrs. Brown" who "does" for me, had watched from my window, and told me that for all of one night she dreamed that she was fencing, troubled through the dream because she ought to leave it to get to her work in time.

The black-out finished; the windows were illuminated in the three walls of the square, the street lamps lit, a miracle to our eyes dwelt so long in darkness and again making a fairy stage scene. The lights brought new details of beauty to my uncurtained window at night with the room dark, painting delicate branches and leaves—swaying in a wind—against the pane, so clear that once I rose to open the window and touch them and found—only air.

The children came back—one by one, two by two, at first—then in a flood. They and the dogs—returning too where there had been few—took the square, but shut no gates and made no cruel segregation of youth and age. The old lady who walks half-a-dozen assorted dogs daily (is that her profession?) is joined always by a group of boys and girls. She moves in the midst of them like a queen, her head bent royally for all that there is to tell and hear. In

e cricket season an important looking man carrying a leather case (going to Government office to rule our destinies?) stops for five minutes or so, to play icket with a team of little boys. Later a white-coated hotel steward, basket hand on his way to shop, does the same. Then each pick up case and asket and go on to the day's work, from this playing field of England. Hide-nd-seek through the day is similarly an open event to all of us who pass. I ave been included in many a game by a smile from the players, sent up to ny open window. In the football season a young soldier coached a team of nall boys. Sometimes howls from players young enough for that, told of asualties, and I looked out on first aid scenes, quickly effective.

One's village neighbours take on familiar identity. The old man who valks his black active and intelligent mongrel before breakfast; the two oung girls who do the same for their spaniel; the fine black retriever who valks himself, galloping across the fallen leaves as over a ploughed country eld. (This is country life, with the rules of it, about exercising man and east.) Later, two small girls in green school uniform, exactly identical to he two tight brown plaits of each of them, pass, morning and afternoon, at he same hour. I look down on them through the branches of the trees, so hat they seem to walk in a fairy-tale forest. (When there is heavy rain the quare turns to a lake, out of which the tree trunks stand like a Florida cedar swamp.) On wet days the little girls run always hand in hand. Once they an so, each carrying an identical large white envelope under one arm. Then —the R.A.F. Squadron Leader with wings and decorations, who comes out each morning with his small yellow-haired son who draws a yellow toy duck on a string, and, frolicking with them, a small yellow puppy. On the day that a slim girl with lovely yellow hair, could join them from her domestic duties, I saw where all the family gold came from.

The postman walks across this village green (it is dewy in summer, mornings sometimes misted like a morning in India); a uniformed messenger with wise dog at his heels; a gold-braided Group Captain with many ribbons and an important paper case; a red-tabbed General taking his little daughter to school. Grandfathers and grandmothers bring out the children, wheeling them in prams or leading them by the hand. Skill and love of years and experience are discernible and also, perhaps, a touching satisfaction in being of use. The white socks, the dainty frocks and hair ribbons of the playing little girls—what each reveal of overworked mothers' heroism! A grey-haired young woman passes daily with her heavy basket, her little dark-haired daughter skipping beside her. Once one did not notice the natural dance of children, which is now significant and important. The small girl whose mother scrubs the opposite steps, plays in the square, running back at intervals to clasp her mother's knees and lift her face for a kiss, so, no doubt, lightening the toil.

Then the young fathers came home. One, with a stiff leg, played hide-

and-seek with a three-year-old blue clad and hooded daughter. She found him flat against a wide tree trunk and her laughter rose to me like a shower of flowers. Young father, child and dog became a familiar morning square scene. Or, reunited couples walked hand in hand, he carrying the basket that she had carried so long alone, one of those sights that lit London's post-war greyness. Watching the returned men with their children, I have wondered from where they came and what memories they carry—of Burma horror, Arnhem, Normandy beaches and a hundred others—endured for this.

I saw the first bonfire lit by boys who had been denied that joy—many fires afterwards, beautiful in the autumn and winter dusk, filling the squares with the haunting smell of woodsmoke and burning leaves, the firemen's illuminated figures joyously busy about them. Branches fall in our square and woodseekers gather them for the fire. Little red-capped and hooded elves take the place in winter of the pink and blue clad summer children.

There is great innocence in the square. One could not imagine evil coming into it—as though it had been consecrated for the children. We have no barriers or unkindnesses apparently. I have thought, watching from my box this London theatre, that here I have seen British civilization in an unconscious manifestation. We are a Commonwealth truly. A handsome young Indian father comes out to play hide-and-seek with his exquisite little olive-skinned daughter dressed in pale pink, dark hair tied with a great pink bow. A baby, put out in his pram, attracts a group of the little green-clad schoolgirls, who are motherly troubled and soothing if he cries, although their heads are hardly higher than the pram. I see a ten-year-old boy explaining the mechanism of a toy to an old woman who sits beside him on a seat. Again it is a dark African student from a Colonial Club, who sits beside a little boy as fair as he is dark, and the boy is showing him a toy aeroplane. Dark and fair head are bent side by side in shared absorption.

These African guests join the games and are wonderful with children, having the child's heart themselves; sometimes a group of them sit on the grass with a circle of children facing them. The picture suggests story telling. Strikingly implicit is the absence of race or colour consciousness shown by the elders mingling with the parties, and to which these children have grown up.

The dogs also are perfect mixers, perfect British world citizens. Does anyone remember the days when Pekes were snobs and were called Woo and Chen and such Oriental names? Now they are levelled democrats like everyone else. There is one called Tig who is exercised morning and evening in the square by a master as large as he is small. And I have met in the Park with his mother whom he was yet too small to leave, an infinitesimal Peke puppy of incredible spirit and adventure who was called "Jumbo," which suited him astonishingly.

I suspect that many enjoy our square who have not the residence qualifi-

ation, although the surrounding basements provide most of the children. Twice only in two years has an irate old gentleman demanded of noisy small boys whether they had any right to be playing here. On the first occasion I joined a Canadian soldier resident who fought the children's battle. Later I learned that there was no cause for worry. The little boys might make a temporary strategic retreat but would quickly return, guessing no doubt that majority vote was on their side.

From my height of vision earth and sky are mine, the tree-tops lovely against blue space. I have seen fly-pasts of many planes over those trees, celebrating the defence of London. For a moment those passing planes and others that fly singly, now on peaceful business, are caught into the life and symbol of our square, where once we were awakened by the sound of other planes; and owls, twittering, warned us . . .

Here there is human courting under the trees that I have seen silver, snow-edged under a moon, pure gold in an autumn sun, transparent pale green and again green, heavy as velvet. And in spring the pigeons act their love-scene outside my window—one to watch—the female pigeon flying softly from branch to branch, apparently indifferent, but with a bright glance over her shoulder, the male pursuing, making a feint too of indifference on occasion, not very successfully. I have watched sparrows gathering materials for house building—a symbol too—and have hoped that these would be happy homes.

All a world and its needs and desires seem held in this narrow square, which I see from my window on London.

CORRESPONDENCE

Italy Revisited

To the Editor of The Fortnightly.

Sir,

At the British Institute in Milan we read in the December number of your review an article by C. M. Franzero entitled " Italy Revisited ". We are painfully surprised to see such a disconcerting description of the actual situation in Italy.

What is most evident to the Italian reader is the anguished terror of the author for all that appertains to the political left, to the point of inducing him to confuse the seat of the socialist party with that of the communists, when he says that the latter have installed themselves in the " ex-casa del fascio " (fascist headquarters) in Milan. The communists, so far, have never dreamt of placing active propagandists at the corner of every street to entice the ingenuous public; unless Mr. Franzero happened to be in Italy during elections and, being unacquainted with democratic methods, did not realize that, just round the corner, he could have had the pleasure of listening to orators of the other parties.

For us, the most sensational assertion is that of the existence of a S.I.R.N. (Information Service for the Repression of Neo-fascism) which, according to the author, replaces the one-time O.V.R.A. We must frankly admit that Mr. C. M. Franzero is a remarkable journalist who in a few days " Revisiting Italy " succeeded in discovering so important a secret as would have constituted an authentic tit-bit for the numerous readers of the opposition newspapers.

The assertion that the F.d.G. (Front of Youth) is a new edition of the G.I.L. (Italian Youth of the Lictor) is not based on fact. As students ourselves, we can assure Mr. Franzero that up to 1943 no students could frequent any school or university without paying the subscription to the G.I.L. at the same time as the school fees. Whereas, at present, the F.d.G. is only one of several juvenile organizations existing in Italy and is not obligatory for anybody. The same may be said of the U.D.I. (Union of Italian Women).

Thanks to this, Italians feel as free as other nations and are doing their best to create a democratic State.

We should be obliged to the writer of your article if he would kindly point out to us in what public resorts we Italians can have " Lucullian meals " for only 800 lire, because at that price we can only find the meal necessary to a normal man (1,500/1,600 calories). Such a meal would cost in our restaurants at least 2,000 lire. The fact that Mr. C. M. Franzero fixes the price of a meal at eight shillings is of no importance; what we have to consider is that the average salary of an Italian runs between 12,000 and 15,000 lire per month. You will easily understand that this salary can only provide us with fifteen meals a month and that the other forty-five meals, as also the cost of clothing, rent and the maintenance of the family, are problems that have to be solved by expedients.

In the purely economic field we may point out that our country has emerged from the war with a consolidated public debt of four hundred billions, one thousand billions of paper currency and floating debts and eight thousand billions (in Italian lire) from dam-

es of war and the German domination. Add to this several hundreds of thousands of ad, wounded and prisoners, and you will understand, especially as regards Southern aly, which is poorer and less industrialized, why there are so many beggars in our streets d why thousands of persons in Naples are still compelled to live in caverns.

We are really sorry, moreover, to see Mr. Franzero accusing the Italians of nationalism hen events, from 1943 onwards (the strikes in March 1943, the enthusiasm at the fall fascism, the guerrilla partisans, the warm welcome to the Allied troops, and so on) e there to prove that the great majority of the Italian people are far removed from utionalism and, admitting that we have suffered for this nationalism in the past, e are now completely cured.

In conclusion Mr. Franzero in "Italy Revisited" expresses his opinion that the Italian epublic "is a joke"; which is in absolute contrast with the arguments contained in The Birth of a Republic" by Elizabeth Wiskemann (THE FORTNIGHTLY, July 1946). Ve may assure Mr. Franzero that were it so, the Republic would never have been born.

Yours truly,

GIULIANA FERRERO, Student of medicine.
GIORGIO GALANSINO, Student of medicine.
GIANNI CAMERINI, Student of law.

Milan.

Mr. C. M. FRANZERO writes:

The criticisms contained in your correspondents' letter are surprising coming as they o from residents in Milan. Everybody passing through the famous Galleria or cross- ng the Cathedral square can see and listen to the communist propagandists. I was n Italy in July and August, and there were no elections. Perhaps during the winter months the propagandists go into hibernation.

If your correspondents have never heard of the S.I.R.N. it is because they are too young—confidences of that kind are not usually given to students.

As regards the price of meals, I really wonder whether your correspondents have ever entered any of the "smart" restaurants. I pass for a well-travelled man of the world, and during my stay in Milan, Turin, Rome, etc., I found that the average price of an excellent meal in a first-class restaurant was 800 lire, sometimes a little more but often less. Whether prices have now gone up is another matter. With reference to the position of salaries and cost of living, your correspondents are merely repeating what I wrote.

Finally, I did not say that "in my opinion" the Italian Republic is a joke—I said that "the new Republic is everywhere treated as a joke."

THE FORTNIGHTLY LIBRARY

VICTORIAN FICTION

By Grace Banyard

WHEN Oscar Wilde wrote: "The nineteenth century dislike of Realism is the rage of Caliban seeing his own face in a glass" he was careful to close the loophole by adding: "The nineteenth century dislike of Romanticism is the rage of Caliban not seeing his face in a glass."* How little Wilde on this occasion sacrificed accuracy for the sake of an aphorism was demonstrated, in the field of literature at least, by the exhibition of Victorian fiction at the National Book League, 7 Albemarle Street, London, which has just ended. If, as the catalogue calls them, 'Novels of Manners' were characteristic—Mrs. Gaskell's *Wives and Daughters,* Anthony Trollope's *The Way We Live Now* or Wilde's own *The Picture of Dorian Gray* are cases in point—just as characteristic were those of 'Social Protest', like Mrs. Trollope's *Michael Armstrong* and Mrs. Craik's *John Halifax, Gentleman,* with their accounts of child labour and machinery riots in the factories, Charles Reade's plea for prison reform *It is Never Too Late To Mend,* or *Sybil,* subtitled "The Two Nations", the rich and the poor in one community, by Disraeli.

The 1947 Caliban seems to be rather more the "savage and deformed slave" of Shakespeare's description and consequently likes his reflection even less than his nineteenth century equivalent. Though, either because his honesty or his disillusion is greater, "romanticism" he now calls escapism.

And a very pleasant piece of escape this exhibition was. Those whose memories cannot go back before 1901 found much for wonder and surprise.

Having in mind the reprint in good tpye which cost 4s. 6d. pre-war, is an inch thick and measures at most seven by five, it is hard to imagine the tyranny exercised by the circulating libraries for so long, when the same text was stretched over the three volumes shown, priced at 31s. 6d. without illustrations. This stranglehold of course was on a society which accepted that books were meant to be borrowed and only bought by the few. Naturally library copies in good condition are exceedingly rare and 'Three-deckers' gave a unique opportunity for seeing their evolution from drabness about 1840 to their blossoming "into a riot of competitive gaiety" fifty years later. To quote from the notes on this section:

> If the three-decker was to die, the great fiction firm of Bentley was determined that it should die gloriously . . . The discount to the lending libraries was 50 per cent. and the publisher and his author could make a respectable profit with a sale as low as 1,000 copies. Since Mudie took 1,500 of any Bentley novel, sight unseen, there was plenty of margin for butterflies, silk bows, chintz and inset calling cards.

The course of George Moore's quarrel with Mudie, who banned *A Modern Lover* published by Tinsley, could be traced with the retaliating pamphlet on view, and 'The Parlour Bookcase' showed a comprehensive selection of Bentley novels such as a family, eccentric enough to buy instead of borrowing, might have assembled.

It was the popularity of *Pickwick* which in changing the status of the part-issue made it a serious challenge to the three-decker. To those who have heard, if grandfather could be believed, of a whole nation waiting for the next shillingsworth of Dickens it was most moving to see the pile of booklets, illustrated by Robert Seymour and Phiz, called *The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club* just as they looked to readers of 1836

---

* The Fortnightly, March 1891.

mpatient to discover what Sam Weller was up to now. In 'Part-issues' examples of George Eliot, Marryat and others were also shown, and boys of all ages would be lured by the 254 penny parts of *Black Bess* with garish pictures.

In 'The Giants' the reprint of *Pickwick* (lent by H.M. the King) published in 1866 was opened to show Dickens's inscription to Queen Victoria. His signature, underlined seven times, seems to indicate some of the flamboyancy which to modern eyes, though not to ears strangely enough, mars his work.

It was the reprint which helped still deeper to dig the three-decker grave. The former borrowers were quick to take advantage of the reduction in price from 31s. 6d., or a guinea for two volumes, to 6s. or less. 'One-volume Reprints' had twelve of them and, compared with present custom, the time between the issue of the original and its successor was short: a year for a Mrs. Henry Wood and a Miss Braddon, three for a Wilkie Collins, and for an Amelia Edwards but six months, according to agreement with publishers and libraries, whose "artificial conventions" were not influenced by the royalty system until the 'eighties.

The process by which one thinks of the author and then of his titles seems to have been reversed in Victorian times. On the spines and covers in this exhibition "*Birds of Prey* by the author of *Lady Audley's Secret*", for instance, is now only a riddle. And in one case where Thackeray's name was printed, I was agitated by the bookseller's ugly little label which had been pasted over all but the first and last letters.

'The Railway Bookstall' of "some not too precise date between 1860 and 1880", designed by Mr. Osbert Lancaster, with its lack of magazines provided one of the biggest surprises. Apart from a couple of annuals the display was of cheap yellow-backs to match the mostly somewhat cheap fiction. Of course, journals like the *Cornhill* only printed stories incidentally—and Hardy, Meredith and Trollope among others appeared in parts in THE FORTNIGHTLY—but it is hard to understand why such periodicals which thus qualified for the fiction stall were apparently not attractive reading for a long journey. The answer is probably that when people were able to think comfortably in terms of years, magazines were only to be procured by annual subscription.

One need not be a Victorian to appreciate 'Some Popular Favourites'. Surely most of these would be enjoyed now; though I never read a 'Ouida' novel I would be glad to try *Under Two Flags*. Here too were Jessie Fothergill's *The First Violin* and the *Trilby* with the engrossing illustrations of George du Maurier, two cherished childhood memories of books about music. There were three really, for though elsewhere the catalogue says Sarah Grand's *The Heavenly Twins* was "an early manifestation of feminism" in that same memory it is the cathedral bells of Morningquest chiming the magic phrase from Mendelssohn's *Elijah*: *a, a a b b b b a, f-sharp d c-sharp, e d*. "He, watching over Israel, slumbers not, nor sleeps." Alas, these were tattered copies to be burnt after scarlet fever, sent by one of those nice grown-ups not too concerned with "suitability". A child who loves books will read anything; nevertheless the taste of that child may be trusted. There were plenty of publishers at the opening of Victorian Fiction; would it be impracticable for one of them to pass by the Austens, the Brontës, etc., which are receiving attention anyway, and to reprint some of these other so readable stories, to make a bridge between the "classics" and the more cautious reader?

In 'Some Dark Horses', "most of which were neglected by their contemporaries" is a remark to arouse the expected controversy. One of them at least, *A Village Tragedy*, seems to have had considerable success. The author, Margaret L. Woods, in some delightful reminiscences written for THE FORTNIGHTLY* stated that Rhoda Broughton sent this first novel to her own publisher and added: "I am glad to say it justified her recommendation for it at once attracted attention, was immediately translated into French

**Oxford in the 'seventies.* September 1941.

and favourably reviewed . . ." In this section too the searcher after reprints might browse.

There was much in the exhibition not touched upon here; particularly in the sections devoted to 'Illustrators', 'Historical' and 'Political' novels, 'The Irish School', 'Sport and the Open Air', 'Tales of the Sea', and 'Sensation, Mystery and Crime' with, to supply the proper moral note, *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* opened at:

> Violence does in truth recoil upon the violent, and the schemer falls into the pit which he digs for another.

Apart from being a most remarkable collection of fiction, these six hundred books symbolized a way of life for ever past, whose graces at least may be yearned over by the twentieth century.

For the catalogue* with its copious annotations a separate review would be just. It is so authoritative and with a scope so wide that its permanent place is on the shelf with the other books about books. Mr. Michael Sadleir writes a Foreword, and no one better fits, seeing that the majority of the exhibits were lent from his collection. And as Mr. John Carter, who arranged the exhibition, is an established bibliographer his Introduction is most erudite. Not least of the attractions of this catalogue is its cover design, adapted from that of The Parlour Library, in which the head of the household is reading without background music to his womenfolk, who neither knit nor darn—they are listening . . .

THE FUTURE OF GOVERNMENT, by Herman Finer. *Methuen.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

THE STATE OF THE WORLD, by Adam de Hegedus. *Cape.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

If there is one lesson that we in our generation have learned it is that economic factors are not the decisive influence in human life and governance. Here are two books very dissimilar in character which command attention because each in its own way gets down to bedrock, acknowledges the primacy of politics. Professor Finer is known for his standard work on English Local Government and for a massive tome, *The Theory and Practice of Modern Government,* which appeared in 1932. The present volume was originally conceived as a supplement to that earlier work, containing as it does a critical analysis of political developments in Germany, France, Great Britain and the United States between 1932 and 1939. But it stands on its own feet by virtue of the prefatory section on our contemporary experience of dictatorships and, above all, by its assessment of democracy's tasks in the days to come.

In the inter-war years, we are reminded, men's preoccupations could be summed up in the economic depression and the menace of war. The democratic systems have emerged triumphant from the ordeal—to the extent that their peculiar properties of political equality and the service of freedom have been vindicated. Yet the "tough bitter secular problems of government" remain, and we have still to ask ourselves seriously the question whether the democratic form of government can be maintained. Professor Finer provides no wholly satisfactory answer. He is a little too prone to marvel that so much has been accomplished. This age of ours, like that of Hobbes, he points out, has plumbed the depths of violence and social passion, and, all things considered, it is, he thinks, a remarkable thing that so many countries still have democratic government and so many more seek it.

The actual lesson he commends to us is 'back to the individual'. Not the class struggle is the source of our troubles but the individual's ignorance, his incapacity to appreciate the needs of

---

**Victorian Fiction: an exhibition of original editions.* Cambridge University Press. 2*s.* Illustrated 6*s.*

others, especially those with whom he is not in immediate contact. How then are people to achieve this mutual concern? Neither religion nor science can provide the necessary unifying ideal. The only thing to do, according to the author, is to recognize that there is no common faith and to draw the appropriate social conclusions, chief of which will be what might be called the principle of reciprocity of freedom, the principle that freedom for all is the necessary condition of freedom for each. This does not seem to square somehow with what we know of human psychology—or at any rate it involves an educational problem which the author conspicuously ignores.

Mr. Adam de Hegedus—whom I know only as the author of that slight but useful study *Hungarian Background*—is a horse from a very different stable. His book is marked (in civil service parlance) for James Burnham, the author of *The Managerial Revolution,* but he is at pains to relegate economic issues to the second place where they belong. Mr. de Hegedus is not offering any prescription but an analysis, a review, of what is actually happening in the world to-day.

He finds, accurately enough, that nationalism still remains the greatest political force of our time and explains that it involves in the first place the persistence of a 'state of war' between the highly assertive national-States in which we conduct our group-life—and have done for 400 years. The nation-State, he reminds us, has a tradition and a prestige which is lacking, for example, to socialism. Modern science enables us to understand the reasons for the tenacity of nationalism, to the frustration of nineteenth century aspirations: thus socialism, or any other intellectual conceit, appeals only to the roof-brain, and the experts have shown that the roof-brain accounts for no more than ten to fifteen per cent. of human behaviour. And "the most typical and important fact about nationalism is that it is urgently separatist in character". Yet the fact remains that the nation-State is "a prison for mankind, a prison with large and small cells."

If we still look in vain, however, for the *horizontal* revolution which will abolish certain privileges of the nation-State, nevertheless interdependence is an actuality, and, human history being regarded as a record of the gradual integration of mankind, it can be said that "the nation-State, the highest existing form of integration, is fighting a losing battle against the facts." To-day we are at the stage of monopoly-nationalism, with the 'spheres of influence' of the Big Three superseding the large number of sovereign States of our forefathers.

There is a deal of repetition in Mr. de Hededus's "short natural history and descriptive anatomy" of nationalism, and perhaps he would have done well to differentiate between nationality and State-power in the compound product. But he has done a useful job of secular exegesis.

WILLIAM CARTER.

PSYCHOLOGIST IN GERMANY, by Saul K. Padover. *Phoenix House.* 15*s.*

Paradoxically, this book gains in value from the fact that it is out of date. It is a somewhat repetitive, but always readable, account of an investigation of the mentality and behaviour of a large group of Germans between September 1944 and May 1945; and our attitudes towards the Germans have been so completely transformed in the less than two years that have passed since their defeat that it comes as a salutary shock to be reminded of how they thought and behaved while Hitler was still alive, while his people were still prosperous from the loot of Europe, and confidently superior to the millions of slaves they were systematically working to death.

Before America entered the war, Dr. Padover had gained a reputation as a historian who had specialized in the life and works of Thomas Jefferson, a hero whose ideals were obviously very near to his historian's heart. There is no evidence

to suggest that he has ever been a professional psychologist, but his ability to conduct a psychological interview, together with his fluent knowledge of German, fitted him for his work in the last nine months of the war, of which this book gives a narrative account. He was the head of a front-line intelligence team, whose work was to interview as many Germans, soldiers and civilians, as possible, with the aim of guiding more exactly the propaganda and morale-breaking activities of the American and British Psychological Warfare Teams, and discovering, if possible, any nuclei of resistance to Naziism in Germany to whom help and assistance could be given. The optimistic accounts of left-wing German refugees suggested that such movements existed and were relatively numerous.

As should be well-known now, such expectations were completely erroneous. Although Dr. Padover found a number of people who had ethical objections to some of the Nazi practices, and an enormous majority who were ready to blame Hitler for losing the war, it was only an exceptional and very aberrant individual who refused to profit by the loot and slave-labour, and none at all who risked verbal protests, sabotage, or slowing-up of war-work. Even the staunchest anti-Nazis, the Social-Democrats of the working classes (the undiscovered communists apparently never recovered from the demoralization produced by the Nazi-Soviet pact) never considered it possible to do anything other than work diligently at carrying out the orders given. A typical example of the attitude is given from the staunch Social-Democrats in a suburb of Krefeld, who were anxious to do anything to demonstrate their democratic principles and help their American liberators (they hailed them in those terms):

> We said that if they were so anxious to show their appreciation, why did they not take pails of water and go out and wash off those offensive Nazi slogans and signs that were plastered all over Krefeld? A hushed silence fell in the room, and Peter Bollig, the fire-eating Socialist, asked in an incredulous voice *"Ist das erlaubt?"* (Is that permitted?)

This was the attitude of the best Germans, the middle-aged ethical democrats, the only group from whom one could hope to construct a German democracy. They shared with their compatriots what an avowed Nazi called the German sickness, *Kadavergehorsamkeit* (cadaver obedience), obeying any order like robots, even against their innermost convictions. Where they differed from most of their fellows whom Dr. Padover interviewed, was in the fact that they were not completely unprincipled. The general picture, most convincing in its detail, is of complete moral abjectness, a universal willingness to deny the men and the ideas they had sedulously followed and profited by, coupled with a feeling of complete irresponsibility for the atrocities about which nearly everybody knew (my experience confirms Dr. Padover's) and excused on the grounds that they were not personally implicated, or, if they were, were merely carrying out orders.

Now that, in our sentimental fashion, we are paying far more attention to the sufferings of the Germans than to those of their victims, it is salutary to be reminded how the Germans behaved, until their last hope of victory was gone, and how, one has every reason to suppose, they would behave tomorrow if the chance arose. We must remember what the German character is like, and what it is capable of. This book also gives a most illuminating side-light on the inadequacies of American military government, faced with such complex problems; that, too, is salutary reading.

GEOFFREY GORER.

THE GERMAN QUESTION, by Wilhelm Röpke. Translated by E. W. Dickes. *Allen & Unwin.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

Among the prolific literature on the problem of Germany this book takes a high rank. Seldom have the historic roots of the disaster which befell Germany, and later the whole world, been more carefully presented than by this writer whom Professor Hayek in his In-

roduction calls rightly "an economist of nusual brilliance and versatility." Professor Röpke deals particularly with the question so frequently asked and yet so incompletely answered: why, after Germany's defeat and political collapse in November 1918, following a few months of anxiety, Prussia, the Junkers, and the heavy industries emerged actually strengthened from the general collapse?

He shows that the right moment for a conversion of the Germans had been lost: "The essential reason was that both in Germany and the victor States there were but few far-seeing men familiar with the German problem who realized the necessity of accompanying Germany's moral revolution with a political and an economic and a social one." It is perhaps understandable that such persons did not come forward in the victor States. Have ever victors produced a genuine feeling for the national traits and imponderabilia of the vanquished? It is far less understandable why the new spirit which was required did not generate within Germany itself; it is more difficult to explain this lack of genuine democratic attitude if one agrees with Professor Röpke about the "fatal separation of individual and collective morality, which distinguishes the German from other nations."

The author has not scrutinized in detail the material and materialistic circumstances which made a development of a German economic liberalism, in the British and American sense, an impossibility. Such an explanation might well have been expected from a man who has devoted the best part of his life to an intense and fruitful study of economics. Here and there some interesting examples of Germany's economic dilemma are

A Series within a Series

In order to keep the "World's Classics" volumes conveniently small, and, at the same time to publish long works in a single volume, a variation, to be known as "Doubles" has recently been introduced. These "Doubles" are printed on India paper, and make possible the inclusion of up to a quarter of a million words, printed in type of reasonable size, within one pair of covers. The price of these "little giants" is 6s. net each, and the most recent examples are

DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA
by
ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE

Mr. SCARBOROUGH'S FAMILY
by
ANTHONY TROLLOPE

AND

JOHN CALDIGATE
by
ANTHONY TROLLOPE

In May we hope to publish two books of outstanding importance

THE BRITISH GENERAL ELECTION OF 1945
by
R. B. McCALLUM & ALLISON READMAN
Illustrated 18*s. net*

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF SOVIET RUSSIA
by
MAX BELOFF
Volume I. 15*s. net*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
AMEN HOUSE LONDON E.C.4

given, for instance where *en passant* some rural problems are discussed. But for the author the German Question is far more a political, socio-political and administrative than an economic one. For this reason in his Epilogue which makes particularly suggestive reading he is more concerned with the political and formal reconstruction of the *Reich* than with the necessity of abolishing its economic incongruities. Even those who, like Professor Hayek in his foreword, favour a decentralized Germany should not forget that such a Germany may not be less unstable and unsettled than a centralized one if economic conditions are not definitely better-balanced than in the previous *Reich*. More consideration of the agricultural, industrial and even distributive conditions required to make the future of Germany economically sane would have been an asset to the book, but such considerations would also have required a full analysis of the economic implications of the typical middle-class Germany and its widespread reactionary elements.

The earnest character of the book is sometimes marred by digressions of a lighter kind which have here and there a comic touch. On page 111 it almost seems as if Professor Röpke wishes to reaffirm the idea of some Germans that "*die deutsche Eiche*", the German oak, is absolutely unique; for though he does not mention that popular tree he gives a vivid account of German forests and claims for Germans "a specially intimate relationship with nature and great respect for her." We cannot see in this a particular German characteristic, but what is certainly a peculiarity of the German attitude to nature is its nationalistic glorification. Inhabitants of a peaceful Germany of the future may be advised —and the middle-classes in particular— to travel more abroad and to see for themselves whether Professor Röpke's contention is right that there is no industrial country "in which it was possible to make grander trips far from the main roads." This small point shows how dangerous it is to interpret national character by sweeping sociological generalizations. Otherwise Professor Röpke's work deserves the greatest attention not only of those who explore Germany's past but also of those who have to devise her future.

HERMANN LEVY.

BOMBER OFFENSIVE, by Marshal of the R.A.F. Sir Arthur Harris. *Collins.* 21*s.*

Our air offensive against Germany has been under fire from the critics from two separate quarters. It has been shot at as being, first, militarily ineffective, secondly, ethically indefensible. There is a *primâ facie* case to be met on both counts. Serious students of the subject have been waiting for the book that would give the adequate answer that is possible to both criticisms. Sir Arthur Harris's is not that book.

It does not meet squarely Sir Henry Tizard's allegation (in an address at the Royal United Service Institution on March 27, 1946) that "the actual effort in man-power and resources expended in bombing Germany was greater than the value in man-power of the damage caused." It does not address itself directly to the disconcerting fact brought out in the United States Strategic Bombing Survey's report that despite the tremendous onslaught on the industrial cities, German production was higher in mid-1944 than it had ever been.

Nor does the book deal adequately with the ethical objection, sometimes crudely expressed in the parrot cry that strategic bombing was nothing but "baby-killing" on a grand scale. (It has been so termed by a recent military writer, Major Hoffman Nickerson, in his *Arms and Policy*, with almost wearisome emphasis.) Sir Arthur Harris's main reply to such a charge is to point to the 800,000 Germans (including women and children) starved to death by our blockade in the first world war. This

argument, admissible if used with discretion, may become a dangerous one; pressed too far, it might be used to excuse gas or plague bombs.

But why not use them, if, as Sir Arthur Harris says, there is no international law of air warfare? The only agreement ever made, he states, was one between the French and the Germans in 1870 about dropping explosives from balloons. The substance behind this statement is, one may surmise, a Hague Declaration of 1899 on balloons and explosives, to which, however, neither France nor Germany was a party. He says nothing about the Hague legislation of 1907, which did touch on air warfare, though very scrappily, and he is also silent on the subject of our Government's undertaking of September 2, 1939, to bomb only military objectives (admittedly an elastic term). It could be argued that that undertaking went by the board when Germany started indiscriminate attacks; but Captain Harold Balfour stated in reply to a question in the House of Commons on March 11, 1943, that it was still our policy to attack only military objectives, and his chief, Sir Archibald Sinclair, implied that also in statements which he made. There is a disquieting element of mystery here.

In Sir Arthur Harris's view the general offensive against industry was the sure road to victory. He had no doubt about the rightness, from any angle, of such a policy. He disclaims having inaugurated the practice of target area bombing, but he certainly worked it for all it was worth. He has little patience with the other school of thought which favoured the selective bombing of special targets—"panacea targets" he calls them—and which seems, on the whole, to have been supported by the experience of the war; for it was by selective bombing that the Allied air forces deprived the enemy of the means of movement by road and rail and thus made

HILARY BOOK COMPANY LTD.

6, West Warwick Place, S.W.1

THE REBELLIOUS HEART MONICA EWER **7/6d.**

Should a nurse allow herself to become involved in the affairs of a patient? This delightful romance answers the question.

THE TALKATIVE PASSION J. B. PRICE **7/6d.**

A story simply and straightforwardly told in noble sentiment. The scene is in Africa.

WIFE IN COLD STORAGE 290 *p.p.* J. B. PRICE **10/6d.**

A remarkable story by a distinguished writer There is tension throughout and clever characterisation.

NON-FICTION

OLD CASTLES IN SCOTLAND HENRY TERRELL, F.S.A. **12/6d.**

The history of Scotland's castles in verse, legend and picture.

his situation militarily and industrially hopeless. That is not to say that the blanket attack on industrial centres was thrown away, but the alternative method gave quicker results.

The book is more satisfying in so far as it is a record of the growth and development of the magnificent striking force which Sir Arthur Harris commanded in the years 1942-45. It is particularly informative about navigational and other scientific improvements which made our offensive so much more effective in the second half of the war. Bombing had previously been a rather slapdash business. Hamborn, he tells us, was attacked in mistake for Essen in March 1942.

Two small *errata* may be noted: the last raid on Berlin before that of the night of January 16, 1943, had been on November 7, 1941, not "in December of 1941", as stated at p. 135; and the big raid on Brunswick in October 1944 was on the night of the 14th-15th, not the 4th-5th as stated at p. 245.

J. M. SPAIGHT.

ONWARD FROM D-DAY, by Major-General H. Rowan-Robinson. *Hutchinson.* 16*s.*

TASK FOR COASTAL COMMAND, by Hector Bolitho. *Hutchinson.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

To be interesting about the war is as difficult now as it was easy two years ago. If Squadron-Leader Bolitho's book had come from the press even a month or two after the war ended, I know that I should have read it through without putting it down. It is a concise, vivid, admirably written account of some of the most difficult and important work done by the R.A.F. Every third page is a story of courage and skill. And yet I confess that to me, at this present moment, it is difficult to read. The fault is mine, not the book's; or rather, I am not even sure that the fault is mine. It is a fault of the time and place in which I read. Here is a sample of the tale that Hector Bolitho tells: "When I was up at St. Eval last night I saw C., who sank his first U-boat a few days ago. He was half excited and half depressed. His brother has escaped from a prison camp in Germany and he has telegraphed to say that he is on his way to Cornwall. C. said: 'I am on operations to-night so I won't see him until I come back in the morning.' I heard later that a signal was received from Headquarters while C. was flying, announcing his promotion to squadron-leader and an award of a D.F.C. When I went down to breakfast the miserable news came through that he has not returned."

The difficulty with this kind of thing now is that it is not near enough to be topical, not far enough away to exert the emotional appeal which it will certainly acquire in ten years' time, perhaps sooner. Meantime this book, and many like it, must stand as a reminder of the difficulties which face publishers in the present period, and the shortages which prevent the publication of books at the time when their appearance would be most effective.

Major-General Rowan-Robinson has solved the problem of topicality because, though his book begins as a commentary on the campaigns from D-Day to the surrender of Japan, it does not end with the end of the war. The retrospective chapters are indeed a remarkably lucid survey of the closing months of the struggle. Their main interest lies, however, not in their own narrative but in the conclusions to which they force the author in his later chapters. The historical part of the book is, as it were, the curve of a graph drawn from known data; it is when the author continues his curve forward into the unknown that he becomes most certain of attention. Wisely he does not stress the obsolescence into which atomic power has driven many of the weapons with which the war was concluded. Too much has already been written on that subject for the average reader to be in need of reminding. What the author does stress

is the indication of the shape of future land warfare, as it was to be seen in the troglodyte fighting and cave defences developed by the Japanese. Nothing that has been revealed of atomic power so far, has indicated that land armies are no longer likely to be required; but the army of the future is likely to depend on air transport for supply, and on air mobility when mobility is needed. At all other times the army is likely to be driven underground.

On the subject of Imperial defence, General Rowan-Robinson emphasizes the importance of instant readiness as opposed to reliance on potential strength—in other words, that if industry and manpower are to have time to make war at all, they must be ready for war throughout the years of peace and not merely at the moment when a war appears likely. Here, though the author does not say so, is the German theory of *Wehrwirtschaft*. From that premise one is driven inevitably to the conclusion that no country can consider itself capable of its own defence unless the morale of its industry in peace is as high as that of its army in war. The final point of his projected graph is therefore that the relationship between leaders and led in the industry of tomorrow must be that which existed between officers and men in a good regiment in 1945. "Let the Government," he writes, "aiming at such happy relations, adopt the Eighth Army's slogan: 'we are all in this together, and together we will see it through.'"

GORDON WINTER.

OLD KOREA, by Elizabeth Keith and E. K. Robertson Scott. *Hutchinson.* 42*s.*

Korea is not only a country of great interest but, at the present time, one of considerable political importance. We know very little about what is happening there, and any book which helped to explain the situation would be of considerable service to all students of international affairs. It must be said at once that this is definitely not such a book.

It may be objected that a reviewer has no right to criticize a work for not being something different; and certainly the authors, by affixing an adjective to their title, have made it clear that they are not describing present conditions. Nevertheless, they suggest the recent emancipation of Korea as a reason for publishing these notes of a journey undertaken nearly thirty years ago

Miss Elizabeth Keith and her sister spent a few months in Korea in 1919, and the haphazard notes of which this book is composed (it runs only to seventy-two pages) were compiled mostly from the conversations of the various missionaries with whom they stayed. They are for the most part of a somewhat generalized and sentimental kind and do nothing to explain the structure of Korean society.

There are a great many full-page illustrations, of which sixteen have been reproduced in colour. It is perhaps unfair

HEFFER'S
of Cambridge

pay good prices for

FINE, RARE & SCHOLARLY **BOOKS**

on all subjects

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD

Petty Cury Cambridge

to judge the quality of a painting only by its reproduction, but there is in these nothing to suggest that the originals are more than competently executed water colours. A general lack of vitality is apparent in the monochrome illustrations, the majority of which are portraits, as indeed are also those in colour.

The chief objection to this book is that it gives an entirely false picture even of the old Korea. In every one of the illustrations the people are depicted either in ceremonial dress or the colourful native costumes which were discarded for general use a very long time ago. This is as misleading as it would be to suggest that the people of, say, Holland invariably wore the picturesque clothes in which before the war foreign tourists were so fond of photographing them.

The book is dedicated to General MacArthur, Lord Louis Mountbatten and Admiral Nimitz "who were the means of freeing Korea from her oppressors. Korea must forever be indebted to them." I wonder! Meanwhile, the present position is that Korea is occupied partly by the Russians and partly by the United States, whose respective armies stand facing one another on the line dividing the two zones. The Russians will not allow anyone to visit the part of the country at present in their control, but we do at least know that they have already stripped it of all its plant. Owing to the ideological conflict between the two occupying powers the Koreans themselves are no longer politically homogeneous, and this charming country, so long oppressed by the Japanese, has now become the chief danger spot in the Far East. But of these matters the authors of this book make no mention.

JOHN MORRIS.

IN THE RAIN AND THE SUN, by the Rt. Hon. L. S. Amery. *Hutchinson.* 21*s.*

JAN SMUTS, by F. S. Crafford. *Allen & Unwin.* 21*s.*

Under the olive trees of Taranto during the first world war, while their train was getting ready, Mr. Amery and General Smuts were recalling the stores of Horace and of English poetry which they could remember. This was, and happily still is, by no means the only field in which these two are worthy champions. Statesmen are not often as physically active in later years as Field Marshal Smuts who —a poor sailor, we are told—travels unceasingly on behalf of South Africa and the Empire, while Mr. Amery's exploits on the mountains of various Continents are commemorated by the mountain in Alberta which is named after him and enables him to decorate his book with a frontispiece more unusual and more grandiose than the ordinary photograph of the author.

It would be hard to imagine a life with fewer wasted moments than that of Mr. Amery (who casually informs us that he talked to so-and-so in Turkish, Russian, Afrikaans or Serbo-Croat). He must have regarded with great sympathy an old fellow in South Africa who had saved up £1,500 and was proposing to settle down in Cape Town to educate himself. In this he resembled a wealthy peasant I chanced to encounter in Serbia who, being an old bachelor, had built a church, a museum and a school for his village and was going to enter the latter in order to learn how to read and write. He had been spared the unpleasantness of which certain Mashonaland chieftains complained to Mr. Amery, then Secretary of State for the Dominions, namely the increasing tendency of their wives to run away. We are not told what advice Mr. Amery gave them; no doubt it was as sensible as what he here gives for the treatment of the Assirians who should, he says, relieve the strain on our military system by being formed into a Legion of homeless warriors with the Poles and others.

Very seldom does Mr. Amery's memory play him false, but in the next edition of this very full book he should amend the statement that the Russian monastery on Mount Athos is called Lavropedi, into which word he appears to have joined

e two Greek monasteries of Lavra and atopedi. He tells us that in the assian monastery he found his command the language became increasingly uent as the libations proceeded, so that seems he did not remember that he was a place known as Pantaleïmon. Otherise we always feel that we can admire nd trust him even as he admires Gertrude ell, the famous Orientalist who was lso 'a magnificent climber'—he intances her fifty-seven hours' ascent of he east face of the Finsteraarhorn—and ven as he could trust the Austrians in the irst world war to observe the principle overning Balkan warfare, the unwritten ruce to cover the midday meal and subsequent siesta. "Absolute safety," said his companion Admiral Troubridge at Belgrade, "till 3.30; after that sudden death."

When the old Boer general, Piet Joubert, was told in 1885 of the discovery of gold on the Rand he said to his informant, who believed himself to be the bearer of glad tidings: "You would do better to weep, for this gold will cause our country to be soaked in blood." The part taken by General Smuts in the subsequent warfare has often been described, as have his political conflicts with General Herzog and others. To all this Mr. Crafford, whose pedestrian style compares unfavourably with that of Mr. Amery, has little to add. He achieves merit in avoiding the adulation of his hero, never hesitating to tell us that as a young man and afterwards he failed, for some reason or another, to be popular with his fellows. The outspokenness in his character, which has frequently been described as tactlessness, was displayed when in the United States he compassionately said that black men were "the most patient of all creatures next to the ass." But his absolute refusal to be diverted from his high aim had its reward when in the first world war he joined the British War Cabinet and was given all manner of honours in this country. Receiving the degree of LL.D at Cambridge, his old University, he was referred to as "like the younger Scipio, our Second Africanus." "Long talks with Smuts and Amery," so wrote Sir Henry Wilson in his diary when Smuts wisely declined Lloyd George's offer to take command in Palestine. Perhaps one day the B.B.C. instead of a Brains Trust, would stage a long—it could not be too long—talk between Amery and Smuts on their contacts in bygone years.

HENRY BAERLEIN.

THE LIFE OF LLEWELYN POWYS, by Malcolm Elwin. *The Bodley Head.* 15*s.*

Already Powysian literature is expanding rapidly as interest grows in a family distinguished not only for diversity of artistic talent, but for affectionate loyalty as well. Mr. Louis Marlow's study, *Welsh Ambassadors,* gave an admirable general outline, furnishing much information about the three best-known members—John Cowper Powys, famous as

CRIME AND BANDITRY, DISTRESS AND PERPLEXITY

WILL INCREASE

UNTIL THE BISHOPS OPEN JOANNA SOUTHCOTT'S BOX

What the Bible says about the Box and the Bishops:

"And the temple of God was opened . . . . . and there was seen . . . . . the Ark (Chest or Box) of his Testament (or Will)".

"And round about the Throne were four-and-twenty . . . . . Elders (Bishops) sitting . . . . (and they) fall down and cast their crowns (their wisdom) before the Throne".
—*Rev. xi.*, 19; *iv.*, 4, 10.

Write for free leaflets to

THE PANACEA SOCIETY,
Bedford, England

lecturer and novelist; Theodore as short-story writer and novelist; Llewelyn as essayist.

In this detailed biography of the youngest member of the trio, Mr. Malcoln Elwin adds much that is new. He provides evidence of the growth of a sensitive and inquiring intelligence, blessed not only with an ancestry bearing the names of John Donne and William Cowper, but also with those present fraternal guides, older in years, who shared his enthusiasms. John Cowper Powys was much more than an elder brother; he was an inspirer who had taken sustenance at the well of the Welsh gods, one Llewelyn came to look up to as the genius in a family peopled by talented, original minds. From this brother, Llewelyn learned to love all the secrets of nature; he also adopted in boyhood that worshipful attitude towards sun and sky, birds and beasts, flowers, trees and grasses which was part of John's secret ritual.

Llewelyn Powys was born at Dorchester in 1884 and his childhood was a particularly happy one. He lived for some years at Montacute in Somerset where his father was vicar. It was in November 1909 that he experienced his first attack of the consumption which was to shadow him and shape his life in the years ahead. The effect of disease on the growth of talent is a subject with which many literary historians have been concerned. Mr. Elwin does not underestimate its importance in regard to this pagan poet whose appreciation of life and philosophy of happiness was intensified by the knowledge of the nearness of death. On the practical side it compelled him to meditate, to turn aside from other employments, such as teaching and lecturing.

EXCELLENT BOOK LIST

Politics—Literature—Fiction

APPLY TO: THE UNIVERSAL BOOK CO.,
113, HENDON LANE, N.3.

While lying ill in Switzerland, where he had journeyed to recapture his health, Powys tried to recall the beauties of his beloved Dorset villages and downs and valleys; he made up his mind to live as fully as possible savouring the hours as they passed. Perhaps it is in the autobiographical writings, as in his novel *Apples Be Ripe* and in the spiritual autobiography *Love and Death*, that we come close to an understanding of a simple but nevertheless, bewildering personality.

"I rail against God," Powys once wrote, "but I don't want him to hear it." In his attitude to Christianity and to religious problems, Llewelyn Powys differed markedly from his elder brothers. Both J.C. and Theodore Powys broke away from that orthodox Christianity their father served, but they retained a belief in the soul's survival or in the angry omnipotence of God. Llewelyn was a hedonist with a contempt for Christianity. To him all religion was synonymous with superstition. Mr. Elwin is not unsympathetic to this uncompromising attitude, because a full knowledge shows how honest and sincere Powys was. Though he lacked philosophic impartiality, which marred such controversial works as *The Cradle of God*, *The Pathetic Fallacy*, and *A Pagan's Pilgrimage*, he had in his heart a passionate ardour and a kindness which might well have been the envy of religious men. Llewelyn Powys for all his denials and denunciations, comes within that category if religion can mean love of man.

It is early yet, as this biographer suggests, to make any forecasts about the place Llewelyn Powys will eventually occupy in English literature. It seems fairly certain that he has earned a reputation as a stylist which will not easily be set aside. Those books in which he writes of the customs and traditions of the West of England, works such as *Dorset Essays*, *Somerset Essays* and *Earth Memories*, will take their place beside the poetry of Herrick and the prose of Lamb.

E. W. MARTIN.

BOOKS ON THE TABLE

WHEN Hitler dissolved the women's organizations in Germany he was creating a big part of the problem which the Control Commission are now trying to solve. The numerical superiority of German women and their subordinate position are factors which make their re-education imperative. The education branch of the Commission asked the Women's Group on Public Welfare to send nominees to report on the prospects of developing associations for women. Helena Deneke, closely linked with Women's Institutes, and Betty Norris, a member of the staff of the Townswomen's Guilds, both fluent German speakers be it noted, undertook the survey, one of the results of which is the publication by the *National Council of Social Service* of THE WOMEN OF GERMANY (1s.).

Both think there is good material for establishing freedom in Germany and that some women there are ready to lead the way but, without material aid for repairs to buildings, the supply of utensils, and the replacement of worn-out clothing, it is difficult to see how teaching in democracy can be made to hold good. Above all, "two basic needs remain unsatisfied: a ration for the ordinary consumer that allows of full work, and sufficient fuel." The suspicion that pamphlets are not read is disquieting here; all who long for, all who are working for peace in the world should buy this one.

Going abroad

Another cheaply-priced booklet which may not receive the attention it deserves is INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES by Phyllis Bottome (*Allen & Unwin P.E.N. Books.* 2s.). The author's choices are America, France, Germany, Austria and Great Britain and her emphatic opinions are much her own. She is entitled to these by virtue of her wide experience and discerning eye and her essay "France of Today" (even with the Panthéon printed as 'the Parthenon') is particularly penetrating.——MOSCOW (*Hutchinson.* 15s.) is a series of sketches by ten of its inhabitants, translated by Peggy Cochrane. The city's chief architect, the director of its Music School, a distinguished member of its University, an actor whose family is identified with the Maly Theatre, an executive in one of its great factories, are some of these. The note of earnest endeavour is sounded as clearly as usual but fails to detract from the enticement of a place which for most of us is unknown.

Farmers and farming

And those about to go further south might begin with THE AUSTRALIA BOOK by John Norwood. (*Crisp.* 5s.). This has been written primarily for English boys and girls and its outline of Australian history, its descriptions of the human, no less than the animal and bird way of life there should succeed in the author's avowed wish to incite children (and their parents) to read further. His hope that you may one day "visit the country and see all these things for yourself" is reinforced by the many photographs which so ably illustrate the book.——Back to English farming we come with THE BUDDING MORROW, yet another of the delightful books of Adrian Bell (*The Bodley Head.* 7s. 6d.). His experiences have ripened in him a philosophy of living to which only extensive quotation could do justice. The land has so far 'got' Mr. Bell that he can say: "Work on a farm is not just a thing you do; it is something that you are." And happy associations arising out of prisoner of war employment make him exclaim: "If only a common personal contact could be substituted for this damned press patriotism, all over the world . . ."

"We all go mad after a war"

How to define THE SHOP ON THE KING'S ROAD by B. Ifor Evans (*Hodder & Stoughton.* 8s. 6d.) is a puzzle. It seems to be a compromise between a novel

MAR 27 1942

and a "documentary" of post-war London, which in places reads like a guide book. Autobiography, though written in the first person, it certainly cannot be, for the episodes impart no feeling of being integrated as if part of a woven pattern. Those who do not look for great originality or depth of thought will enjoy the quiet observations of the ex-service man who buys a bookshop on impulse. But after reading, the thought is left that had he not rushed off to the Picasso exhibition, to matins at the nearby church, to Dora Gordine's sculptures at the Leicester Galleries, to the British Legion display in the Albert Hall, to the home of the Chelsea Pensioners—all in working hours—he might have found in his own bookshop more satisfactory answers to his riddles. In other words, he was lucky in these days to have a Mrs. Porlock and a Grace to look after his goods while he went gallivanting and he was unlucky in being able thus to avoid the spiritual discipline which might have grown out of hard and interesting work. All of which presumably is not the effect the author intended. Awed by his scholastic eminence one is perhaps naïvely surprised that a Doctor of Literature should not write an entirely satisfying book.

Regency revels

It is always a great pleasure to be able to read a play that one has enjoyed and in THE FIRST GENTLEMAN by Norman Ginsbury (*Hammond, Hammond.* 8*s.* 6*d.*) the pleasure is enhanced by the discovery that it reads still better than it played. The stage characterizations hovered rather uneasily on the edge of caricature, with Robert Morley (surely rightly, for the Prince Regent's sense of humour must have allowed him to guy himself occasionally) not even hovering. Into this atmosphere of semi-burlesque Amy Frank's Caroline, Princess of Wales, magnificently played, intruded with sombre tragedy. The book shows less sign of divided aim and we can now be sorry for Caroline without feeling uncomfortably that perhaps the author intended us to laugh at her. This leaves us free to appreciate the ironies of Prinny when, for instance, his appearance is greeted by a volley of vegetables, or his instinctive lapse into melodrama as he leaves her bedside to discuss his daughter's funeral arrangements. These people ring true; that they do not rely on a stage to bring them to life is surely the sign of a good play. Only a Bernard Shaw may break the rules.

To those who saw the play the numerous photographs of the production will serve to keep the memory green, and aspiring playwrights should be able to take courage from the author's introductory remarks.

Story tellers

Aled Vaughan edits the first group of what is to be an annual collection of tales called CELTIC STORY (*Pendulum Publications.* 6*s.*) designed to represent the work of writers from Scotland, Wales, the west country and Ireland. Some of the authors are well known, and not exclusively for short stories. The invitation to would-be contributors seems to indicate that this is a medium for new writers, though one at least of the present pieces has been published before—"Moon is only moon" by Elizabeth Myers strikes a pleasant chord of memory from its appearance in THE FORTNIGHTLY in May 1941. The editor however in his foreword says the stories "are not experimental; it has been the aim of myself and the publisher to give a discerning public a volume of entertaining stories that follow the trend this form of art has taken during the past six years." Though the regional thesis can be pushed beyond reason, a sense of poetry not being peculiar to "Celticism", these stories do indeed reflect humour, pathos and imagination, and the book makes good company for the idle minute.

GRACE BANYARD.

ADVERTISEMENT AND BUSINESS OFFICES: 4, 5 & 6, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.1
PUBLISHED FOR THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW, LTD., BY HORACE MARSHALL & SON, LTD., Publishing Department, Temple House, Tallis Street, E.C.4
PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY GEERINGS OF ASHFORD, LTD., 80 HIGH STREET, ASHFORD, KENT
PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND